Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 60 ST. LOUIS, MO. JULY 1, 1932.

BROWSING AMONG THE ANCIENT CLASSICS

Dr. H. J. Schick

To the modern pastor a study of the theology of the Greek classics is of absorbing interest. We cannot, of course, in a paper limited as this one is, go into any deep or thorough analysis of this subject. To pastors who have the time and inclination we would recommend *Naegelsbach,* "Die Homerische Theologie," one of the standard and most complete treatises on Homeric Theology. Another outstanding work on this subject is *W. E. Gladstone's,* "Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age," a more voluminous work than Naegelsbach, but less scientific and complete. But the fact that the author looks at every topic in its relations to Christianity and the Bible would be of great interest to the modern pastor. Written also in a nobly Christian as well as scholarly spirit is *W. S. Tyler's* volume, "The Theology of the Greek Poets," illustrating the resemblances and contrasts existing between the Bible and natural or traditional religion as found in Greek poetry.

In the *Homeric* world the conception of Divinity is polytheistic. There are many classes of divinities, more or less limited in power. However, one god is supreme, Jupiter or Zeus, the father of gods and men, who sits enthroned on Mt. Olympus. It is an interesting question as to whether in the supremacy of Jupiter or Zeus we might find vestiges of a primitive monotheism. Of no less interest is the trinity or triad composed of Zeus, Athena and Apollo. Zeus is the all-father; Athena is the wisdom born of him, and Apollo is the son who is the voice or word of the all-father. Noteworthy in this connection is also the fact that when the heroes

of the Trojan war offer their prayers to these three divinities, they address them as if they were one being, one in mind and purpose and aim, as for example in that oft-repeated prayer: "Would that father Zeus, Athena, and Apollo, etc." (Ilias 2: 371; 4: 288; Od. 7: 311; 24: 375, et al) From the marked peculiarity of these gods and the functions ascribed to them, Mr. W. E. Gladstone in Vol. 2, sec. 2, on "The Traditive Element of the Homeric Theo-Mythology," argues that they are "traditional divinities, derived in the main features of their character and office from some earlier and purer religion, and ultimately from a direct revelation, though these primitive features are obscured and disfigured by the superstitions of the vulgar and the inventions of the poet." And these superstitions and inventions have given to the Homeric gods the garments of human frailties. Divine nature is only human nature exalted and exempt from death. The Homeric god is essentially a celestial and immortal super-man,—a dim shadow of that Being whom we describe as an infinite Spirit, who is Life, Light and Love, and who is best known to our hearts by the name of "Our Father."

Stimulating is a study of the Homeric conception of *sin,* its expiation and penalty. In Homer, sin is folly, madness, blindness, missing the mark, transgression. One meets the verb ἁμαρτάνειν, missing the mark (II 5: 287), also the verb ὑπερβαίνειν, to transgress (Od. 3:206; 22: 168), but the word most frequently employed to express wrong-doing, is ἄτη, a word meaning, to befool, to deprive one of his senses or reason, and therefore the cause of mischief and misery. In both the Illiad and the Odyssey ἄτη is both sin and suffering, both folly and calamity. In other words, sin and its punishment are inseparable; to commit sin is to invite punishment; folly leads to calamity; sin is misery. However, sin may be expiated and the gods may remit the penalty, when duly propitiated by prayers and offerings:

> "The gods, the only great and only wise,
> Are moved by offerings, vows and sacrifice;
> Offending man their high compassion wins,
> And daily prayers atone for daily sins."
>
> (Il. 9: 497 sqq.)

In regard to punishment after death, Homeric theology pictures the underworld not so much as a state of retribution, but rather as a place where mortals live on, retaining the same character and habits, and following the same pursuits as in the upper world. Thus Orion is a giant hunter still; Minos continues to administer justice; Agamemnon, Ajax and Achilles, each preserves unchanged the essential character he had on earth. The

average mortal when dead reaps the natural consequences of his conduct. But positive punishment is meted out to those guilty of unnatural crimes or rebellion against the gods. Thus one may see Tityus, Tantalus, and Sisyphus suffering perpetual tortures corresponding to their crimes:

"There Tityus, large and long, in fetters bound,
O'erspreads nine acres of infernal ground;
Two ravenous vultures, furious for their food,
Scream o'er the fiend, and raven in his blood,
Incessant gore the liver in his breast,
The immortal liver grows, and gives th' immortal feast.
There Tantalus, along the Stygian bounds,
Pours out deep groans (with groans all hell resounds);
Even in the circling floods refreshment craves,
And pines with thirst amidst a sea of waves;
When to the water he his lip applies,
Back from his lip the treacherous water flies."
Sisyphus—
With many a weary step, and many a groan,
Up the high hill he heaves a huge round stone;
The huge round stone resulting with a bound,
Thunders impetuous down, and smokes along the ground.
Again the restless orb his toil renews,
Dust mounts in clouds, and sweat descends in dews."

(Od. 11: 576 sqq.)

Thus Homer bears testimony to that immutable law: "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall be also reap."

The great institute of teaching by which we moderns may still profit is the Greek tragedy. Whereas modern dramatic art seeks first to entertain and then to instruct, the Greek tragedy was first didactic, and after that, diverting. The three masters of Greek tragedy are *Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides.* Of the seventy tragedies ascribed to Aeschylus only seven are extant; of Sophocles, to whom one hundred and seventeen tragedies are credited, only seven have survived; and from Euripides who wrote ninety-two tragedies, we have seventeen. All three masters were in part mutual contemporaries. Let us note some items of interest in their productions.

The first great law which the tragedians recognize is, that the sinner must suffer for his sin. "For him that hath done the deed to suffer for it—thus cries a proverb thrice hallowed by age":

Δράσαντι παθεῖν τριγέρων μῦθος τάδε φωνεῖ.

(Choeph. 311)

The law of retribution, the lex talionis, stands out prominently on the pages of the triumvirate of Greek tragedy. Note in *Aeschylus* (Agamem. 1562):

> 'Tis robber robbed, and slayer slain; for, though
> Oft-times it lag, with measured blow for blow,
> Vengeance prevaileth
> While great Jove lives. Who breaks the close-linked woe
> Which heaven entaileth?"

Does not this remind us of some old Scripture doctrines, such as "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth"; "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed"; "they that take sword shall perish by the sword"; "the soul that sinneth it shall die."

Between sin and suffering is a very close connection like that between sowing and harvesting:

> "Blood for blood, and blow for blow—
> Thou shalt reap as thou didst sow.
> A haughty spirit, blossoming, bears a crop
> Of woe, and reaps a harvest of despair."
> (Choeph. 310)

The law of restributive Justice may be especially seen blasting its way through that history of blood and crime, known as the triology of Aeschylus, and consisting of the *"Agamemnon,"* the *"Choephori"* and the *"Eumenides."* The Agamemnon treats of that chieftain's return from Troy to be murdered by his wife, Clytemnestra; the Choephori represents Electra, Agamemnon's daughter, with her maidens, visiting her father's grave with votive gifts, and rewarded by the return of her brother, Orestes, to slay the murderous mother and her paramour; and the Eumenides shows Orestes, accused by the Furies, defended by Apollo, and absolved by Athene. Thus blood-shed follows blood-shed throughout the Agamemnon and the Choephori; the law of retribution reigns supreme. But the law is followed as it were by the gospel of reconciliation in the Eumenides, where the Erinyes themselves are appeased, and the Furies become the gracious ones. The demands of Justice are satisfied and Mercy prevails.

Among the tragedies of *Sophocles* the "bright consummate flower" of all is *"Oedipus Tyrannus."* It illustrates the grand maxim of Solon" to praise no one happy before his death." The story of Oedipus Tyrannus is briefly as follows:

"Laius, the king of Thebes, has been told by an oracle that, if a son were born to him by his wife Jocaste, the boy would be his murderer. When Oedipus is born, his parents expose him on Mt. Cithaeron, but he is rescued by a compassionate shepherd and becomes the adopted son of Polybus, king of Corinth. Grown to

manhood the oracle of Apollo at Delphi tells him that he will be a parricide and guilty of incest.

Oedipus flees from Corinth and meets his father, King Laius. The two quarrel and Oedipus kills his father unintentionally and not knowing that the slain man is his father. He comes to Thebes just in time to save the city from the terrible Sphinx, and as Laius does not return, is rewarded with the royal throne and the hand of the queen Jocasta.

Oedipus reigned nobly and prosperously and lives happily with Jocasta who bears him four children.

But after some years a plague descended upon the people and the oracle at Delphi declared that it was for Laius's death. The act of regicide must be avenged. Oedipus undertakes the task of discovering the murderer, and eventually discovers his own birth and the fulfillment of both the former oracles. Jocasta hangs herself, and Oedipus in his despair puts out his eyes."

The moral of the tragedy is expressed in these concluding verses:

"Dwellers in our native Thebe, fix on Oedipus your eyes,
Who resolved the dark enigma, noblest champion and most wise.
Glorious, like a sun he mounted, envied of the popular throng
Now he sinks in seas of anguish, plunged the lashing waves among.
Therefore with the old world sages, waiting for the final day,
I will call no mortal happy, while he holds his house of clay,
Till without one pang of sorrow, all his hours have passed away."

True happiness is not the portion of mortal beings. Only God is happy and blessed.

In *"Oedipus Coloneus"* we have a natural sequel to Oedipus Tyrannus. The blind, crushed and exiled king finds happy asylum in the sanctuary of the Furies at Athens. There follows rest from his weary wanderings, expiation of his involuntary crimes, and restoration to greater power and honor. Like Job he has been cast down, but like Job he has also been raised up and vindicated.

Other works of Sophocles are the following:

"The Trachiniae" which derives its name from the fact that the chorus consists of Trachinian women. The subject is the death of Hercules, the son of Jove who could be made perfect only through suffering; who finds life in death, and who by passing through life-long labors and a tragical end comes to rest. After a life as an exile, a wanderer, a sufferer and a servant he attains life divine. Is there an unconscious prophecy here concerning one who was greater than Hercules,—even the Servant of Jahve?

In *"Ajax"* one may see how the arrogant and impious are brought low through the power of the gods. How frail, helpless

and weak are after all the mightiest of men, when they set themselves against the laws of Heaven.

"Electra" furnishes a fine example of the perfect adaptation of punishment to crime. There is a divine nemesis in human affairs.

"Antigone" depicts the conflict between the lower and the higher law, and asserts the supremacy of the law and government of God. Antigone "rises to a moral sublimity that finds its parallel only in the annals of martyrdom, in which tender and delicate, yet heroic and devoted women have ever borne a conspicuous part."

The third member of the great tragical triumvirate of Greece is *Euripides.* Of all his extant works *"Alcestis"* is the most interesting from a theological viewpoint. According to the tragedy Alcestis is the wife of King Admetus of Pherae in Thessaly. By the grace of Apollo the privilege was granted Admetus that he should escape death on condition that a substitute be found who would agree to die in his stead. Alcestis becomes the substitute. But she is brought back to life by Heracles and restored to her husband. The play opens with a colloquy between Apollo and Death who has come for his prey, Alcestis. Death suspects Apollo of interfering with his rights. Apollo declares that he has no idea of using with Death any plea but justice. Whereupon Death replies as follows:

"Death: What need of bow, where justice arms enough?
"Apollo: Ever it is my wont to bear the bow.
"Death: Ay, and with bow, not justice, help this house.
"Apollo: I help it, since a friend's woe weighs me, too.
"Death: And now wilt force from me this second corpse?
"Apollo: By force I took no corpse at first from thee.
"Death: How, then, he above ground—not beneath?
"Apollo: He gave his wife, instead of him, thy prey.
"Death: And prey, this time at least, I bear below!
"Apollo: Go, take her! for I doubt persuading thee—
"Death: To kill the doomed one? What my function else?
"Apollo: No! Rather to despatch the true mature.
"Death: Truly I take thy meaning—see thy drift!
"Apollo: Is there a way, then, she may reach old age?
"Death: No way! I glad me in my honors, too!
"Apollo: But young or old, thou tak'st one life—no more!
"Death: Younger they die, greater my praise redounds!
"Apollo: If she die old—the sumptuous funeral!
"Death: Thou layest down a law the rich would like!
"Apollo: How so? Did wit lurk there and 'scrape thy sense?
"Death: Who could buy substitutes would die old men.
"Apollo: It seems thou wilt not grant me, then, this grace?

"Death: This grace I will not grant; thou know'st my ways!
"Apollo: Ways harsh to men, hateful to gods, at least!
"Death: All things thou canst not have: my rights for me!"

To which Apollo retorts that Heracles will soon be at hand to rob Death of his prey.

Alcestis faces the impending doom with a spirit that is both beautiful and heroic. She bedecks herself nobly and offers prayers before every altar in the house of Admetus. Affectionate and touching are the farewells:

"Her children, clinging to their mother's robe
Wept meanwhile: but she took them in her arms,
And, as a dying woman might, embraced
Now one and now the other: 'neath the roof,
All of the household servants wept as well,
Moved to compassion for their mistress; she
Extended her right hand to all and each,
And there was no one of such low degree
She spoke not to nor had an answer from."

Admetus is heart-broken, deeply conscious of the great sacrifice his wife Alcestis is bringing. He implores her to stay. He wishes that he might have "the power and tongue of Orpheus" so that he might rescue her:

"Down would I go, and neither Plouton's dog
Nor Charon, he whose oar sends souls across,
Should stay me till again I made thee stand
Living, within the light! But, failing this,
There, where thou art, await me when I die,
Make ready our abode, my house-mate still!
For in the self-same cedar, me with thee,
Will I provide that these our friends shall place,
My side lay close by thy side! Never, corpse
Although I be, would I division bear
From thee, my faithful one of all the world!"

Alcestis is buried with proper ceremonies, and the funeral train returns to the house of Admetus. Heracles who had been entertained in a most royal manner by Admetus, hears of the great sorrow that has come to his friend Admetus. He resolves to go to the tomb and bring Alcestis back. He succeeds in this and Admetus is astonished exceedingly:

"Admetus: And do I see my wife, whom I entombed?
"Hercules: I marvel not that thou art diffident.
"Admetus: I touch her; may I speak to her as living?
"Hercules: Speak to her; thou hast all thy heart could wish.
"Admetus: Dearest of women, do I see again

That face, that person? This exceeds all hope.
I never thought that I would see thee more."

Admetus is overjoyed and orders that "the altars breathe incense to the gods" and that the whole household rejoice "over this blessed event."

The chorus moralizes the action as follows:

"With various hand the gods dispense our fates:
Now showering various blessings, which our hopes
Dared not aspire to; now controlling ills
We deem'd inevitable: thus the god
To these hath given an end exceeding thought.
Such is the fortune of this happy day."

Among other plays by Euripides which pastors might find interesting and helpful mention should be made of *"Hippolytus,"* in which Artemis, the goddess of chastity, plays an important part; *"Andromache"* relates the fortunes of her who was once Hector's wife; *"Iphigenia"* presents a study in human sacrifices and rescues; the *"Troades"* is concerned with the sorrows of noble Trojan women just after the fall of Troy; in the *"Suppliants"* Athens appears as the champion of humanity against Creon who has refused burial to the Argive warriors slain before its walls.

One cannot but he impressed with the prominence of the religious element in these ancient classics. The age-old and yet ever new questions concerning God, man and eternity are answered by these ancients in a manner that both delights and amazes. The existence of a supreme Divinity, his eternal laws with their rewards and penalties, the frailty of man and his dependence upon God are recognized. The efficacy of prayer is taught. The existence after death is declared. Reconciliation between God and man is stressed. But these ideas are still vague, although one notes progress in the search for light. It is yet starlight, not day-light. The Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of man, Atonement, Reconciliation, Justification and Sanctification and the whole plan of Salvation is revealed later in the fulness of glory in the coming of the Christ.

In closing this study of the ancient classics, attention is called to a truly remarkable passage taken from the chorus in the Oedipus of Sophocles:

"O may I live
Sinless and pure in every word and deed
Ordained by those firm laws, that hold their realm on high!
Begotten of Heaven, of brightest Ether born,
Created not of man's ephemeral mould,
They ne'er shall sink to slumber in oblivion,
A Power of God is there, untouched by Time.

Pride plants the root from whence the tyrant grows.
Insolent pride, if idly surfeited
With plenty inordinate, injurious wealth,
Mounts to his pinnacle, then leaps amain
Down a precipitous doom, where foothold finds he none.
Beneath the arm of God I would shelter me,
And pray him to maintain the people's cause,
Yea, all who strive for the universal good.

But if there be who walks disdainfully,
Reckless in act or word,
Fearless of Justice passing without awe
The abodes of Deity,—
Let evil destiny take him for her own,
And quench his ill-starred wanton spirit, unless
He learn in time to traffic without wrong,
And hold his hands from sacrilegious gain;
Nor in mad folly grasp at things forbidden.
What man in such a course shall keep his soul
Unblasted by the artillery of Heaven?
Nay, were such lives continued in renown,
Most idle were our service.—

* * * * *

Zeus, if thy reign be not a fable of men,
If thou art Lord of all things, let thine eye
Behold, let thine eternal power o'ertake!"

Mr. *Matthew Arnold* in his essay: "Pagan and Mediæval Religious Sentiment" grows very enthusiastic concerning the above lines. "No other poets," he declares, "who have so well satisfied the thinking power, have so well satisfied the religious sense." Be that as it may, the cited words which reveal the fervor of the prophets of God, may well be the prayer of every pastor and layman:

"O may I live
Sinless and pure in every word and deed
Ordained by those firm laws, that hold their realm on high!"

SERMON SKETCHES

Sunrise or Sunset Education

By E. H. Hoefer

July 3

Text: Matt. 16: 26 "What shall it profit, etc.

Introduction:

1. Jesus distinguishes here between physical and spiritual life.

2. He taught,—slough off the old where gain is the highest reward, and put on the higher, the newer.

3. Education to many people it only means to gain the "whole world!" Think of these things in days of commencements.

Purpose of this sermon:

I. to show the dangerous trends in many modern minds regarding the purpose of education.

II. To show that Ed. unless intended to develop for greater human service, results in a race of cunning cruel fiends, and the end of that race is self-destruction.

I. Education for many is life's sunrise.

New vistas opened. New powers released. For others it becomes life's sunset. Come doubts, disillusionment, sometimes despair and suicide. These sit in scorners' seat and hurl cynics' ban.

2. Phenomena of Height—the higher you go, farther you see, dizzier you get, so in education.

3. Education in past, privilege of few. Not easy to get. Survival of fittest. These very often would have succeeded in smaller measure even without education. Their character and personality more credit than their schooling. Yet we mistook their success as fruit of their education.

X—3 out of 100 students recently polled, admitted being in school to study. Old Ed. ideal was—develop personality to highest power. Now commercial courses most popular. Translatable into jobs and easy money.

II. Church was mother of Education.

1. Church at best always patron of Education at its best.

2. Drifting of many educated people away from church, cause for concern.

3. Causes: A.—Churches have not kept up to level of educational advance. B.—Pride has become the God of the educated. When man has no other God, he makes himself one.

3. Task of Religion to champion Sunrise Education.

4. Sunset Education seeks: 1. Conserve only old traditions;

2. Set up educated aristocracy—in our day, a mob of cynics. X—the late Ralph Barton.

Conclusion:

Tribute to early religious educators.
Tribute to founders of many colleges and universities.
Tribute to good teachers, and noble scholars.
Grow wiser not only in fact, but in true Wisdom.

King's Justice

July 10

Judges 1: 7—"And Adonibezek said, Three score and ten kings, having their thumbs and great toes cut off, (once) gathered their food under my table. . . . As I have done so God has done unto me."

Introduction:

written.

1. A. was overlooked when "Good losers I have known" was written. Even if cruel, a "good sport" who took his medicine even as he had given it. Context.

2. O. T. tells gruesome stories of primitive justice. Jael. Eglon. etc. Text tells of another gruesome practice to render soldiers harmless.

Discussion:

I. Vengeance.

1. Difference between O. T. and N. T. ideas on vengeance. "Eye for an Eye"—Paul, "Vengeance is mine saith the Lord."

2. We live in N. T. era, but much of O. T. still remains. Race hatreds. Honor slayings. Gang ethics.

3. Futility of Vengeance. Only pride satisfied. Vengeful treaties, perpetuates hatred. X—Ben Hur smashing Messala's wheel. X—In movies, when villain gets his—children howl gleefully. Vengeance should be God's.

II. Might Makes Right.

A. accepted that without question. Bickering at disarmament conferences shows same attitude. X—U. S. "Big Stick" policy. X—Danish Fleet destroyed by English. X—England in India. If Revolutionary War lost, Washington hanged as traitor.

III. Haughty Moderns can learn lesson in Stoic resignation, even from a primitive king of Jerusalem.

1. Contrast with "depression howlers."

2. Fine weather Christians.

3. Good-Loser complex as necessary as Victory Complex. Need for sense of Appreciation, Justice, less complaint.

July 17

"We Go a Fishing" or Hail the Kicker

John 21: 3-4—"Simon Peter saith unto the other disciples, I go fishing, and they said, We will go with you."

Introduction:

Truth has many faces: God in Bible; in great thinkers and prophets; in Jesus; in nature. Jesus liked men of nature, from great Out-of-Doors. Used examples from nature to illustrate spiritual principles—Parables. Even when fishing, disciples were taught. So we would go fishing in life's great sea of truth for a catch. We too far from sea of Galilee, fish right at home. Can learn from humble catfish.

Story: Before refrigerators in ships, holes let sea water into holds where codfish were kept alive. Flesh always soft when harbor reached. Caused by inactivity. Few catfish introduced, kept stirring cod with their horns. Result was, firmer codfish flesh.

Application: Value of the Kicker in Society.

I. Among the Nations.

Progress comes through the prodding of social and political radicals. Numerous examples from history. Russia—most active catfish today.

II. In Education.

Advance dependent upon iconoclasts. Examples: Froebel, Pestalozzi, Glenn Frank, Hutchins, Mason, etc.

III. Politics and Economics.

Lincoln, Lovejoy, John Brown, Bryan, LaFollette, Berger, Thomas, Hahn, Debs.

IV. Church and Religion.

Old Testament prophets, John the Baptist, Jesus, Paul, Luther.

The various "Isms" and sects that stir the body of the church. Kickers in the local church should not be despised. Religion that runs easy becomes soft.

Thank God for the catfish as well as the cod. Get new appreciation for the iconoclast, absence of them results in stagnation and death.

Conclusion:

After all, each has a place to fill in the sea of life, "If you cannot on the ocean, sail among the swiftest fleet, you can—," etc.

July 24

What Worth — the 20th Century Church

Matthew 5: 13—"If salt loses its flavor, what can make it salt again? It is fit only to be cast out and trodden under the feet of men."

1. House-cleaning time. Some businesses—summer inventory.

2. What is church worth? our question. Answer—necessarily controversial for all questions of value are relative. Example—Diamond ring, worth $100 in New York might not be worth cup of hot coffee in Alaskan wilderness. Example—1925 model car, driven 2,000 miles, might be worth $500 to owner in terms of service. $50 might be the value to a dealer in terms of salability.

3. Only one commonly accepted standard possible, "By their fruits shall ye know them." If ye do the things I have commanded, men will know that you are my disciples—Jesus. Put those words as spectacles to eyes and examine our church. Sevenfold vision of Guilt—Sevenfold vision of Duty.

I. Look first for the dust, cobwebs, dryrot, gilt that purports to be gold; 1st reaction is shame, blush of guilt.

1. "Go into all the world" said Jesus.

a. Progress of first decades comparatively greater than succeeding centuries. Handful of first loyal souls "Cast out into Deep." They did. No quarter asked. No compromise made with evil.

b. We see: Mission deficits, lack of interest, grumbling when money is sent away. Mission dollar comes out of pocketbook with as much difficulty as 2nd molar.

2. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God"—Jesus and other similar challenges.

b. We see: Beautiful churches and ugly—boosting attendances; balancing budgets; entertaining crowds; mutual jealousies; petty politics. "Lord what wilt thou have me do" is faith needed.

3. "That they may all be one" was Jesus' prayer.

b. We see: "Denominations the mistakes of history." If Rome had not been selfish, worldly, intolerant—no Reformation. If Spiritual affinity of individual soul to God had been recognized—no Pietism or Spiritualism. If recognized influence of spirit over body—no Christian Science. If true religion, care for widows and fatherless in affliction—no social welfare state-controlled and outside guidance of church. If Church had place for youth—no Y. M. C. A. or Y. W. C. A. etc. If Church stressed Justice and Righteous-

ness—no anticlerical socialism. And the mistakes go on to produce new shame for Church.

4. Old Covenant witnessed prophets thrown out of organized religious society: Amos, Jeremiah, Elijah. In new covenant that continues—Jesus himself, martyrs of the church. Even today—keenest religious thinkers often must leave church to escape being cramped by fossils, and chilled by moss.

5. Church should be bride of Prince of Peace. Yet has blessed wars, and continues to countenance slaughter among the nations. Example: 3 girls in Rochester, jailed for distributing anti-war literature in thorough accord with the pact of Paris.

Goethe: "Against ignorance even the gods fight in vain."

6. Church separated from church to become independent.

a. Review history of church's slavery to state and attempts to free itself from the yoke.

b. I see flags in all churches; patriotic speeches; preachers in parades, pulpits recruiting stations.

7. "Every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord," etc.

a. 60 million churchmen in America.

b. I see pathetically few Christians. Example: Church like town that built fine stadium, bought baseball suits and equipment, great crowds, but produced no home run hitters.

Yet:

II. Vision of hope and courage.

Church has divine commission. Dante: "Church has come a long journey, and passed many graves along the way." Do not say, "My church is no longer a torchbearer of Christ, but become entertainer and money-grabber, I owe her no allegiance."

Love the Church, and seek to redeem her because

1. The good she has done to you through Christian training. Conscience is largely church-made.

2. Church not an exhibition of good people, but a school for the training of imperfect ones.

3. Opportunity for great work in and through the church.

4. Of memories of the good she has done and the great souls that have labored in her ranks.

5. She still is the only institution that claims to want to follow Jesus as her only head and ideal.

6. The church needs help even more than criticism.

7. Because the church holds out hope and faith in the possibility of the Kingdom of God here on earth, and that it exists in heaven.

August 7

Modern Balaks or The Human Tendency to Bar Progress

Text: Numbers 22: 2-6. Story of Balak's attempt to curse Israel and impede progress toward Canaan.

Introduction:

1. Narrate Context.
2. Israel's experience common. Church also opposed as to workability of its Kingdom ideals.
3. Even a similarity in strategy of opposition: force, ostracism, ridicule, religious prejudice.

I. We frequently become Balaks and oppose advance.

1. "Gott mit uns" and with nobody else.
2. Opposition to street lights and bathtubs in last century.
3. R. R. telegraph opposed because no reference to it in prophets.
4. Robert Fulton, "Devil going down Hudson with sawmill on raft."
5. Wright brothers were considered "Crazy sons of crazy preacher." Numerous instances of opposition today, equally ridiculous.

II. Why are there Balaks who oppose the new order of things?

1. Money is made out of the old order.

Example: Minister of southern church who fought for right to own slaves, which constituted the church's endowment.

Example: Stagecoach builders opposed R. R.

Example: Modern machinery. Social legislation protecting men rather than profits.

Progress cannot be eternally stopped, but retarded.

2. Innate Lethargy. Conflict, youth and age. Struggle for few years, then stop and rest on oars, "I have diploma." "I am confirmed and know it all." Exceptional people never know this creeping paralysis.

Example: Jesus as contrasted to Pharisees.

3. Do not understand, or do not want to understand the implication of the new ideas. Unfriendly feeling between old and young doctors, preachers, laborers, etc. Status Quo becomes holy, and thus inviolable.

III. What to do?

1. Prove all things, hold fast to the good.
2. Remain openminded and openhearted.
3. Remember there is progressive revelation in all things, even religion.

4. Help church become a motor rather than a brake.

Conclusion:

Ponder that everyone must make a choice, either to advance or retard the "advance of Israel into the promised land."

August 14

Detours and Highways

Matthew 7: 13-14 and John 14: 6.

Introduction:

1. Joy of Touring. Seeing new country, new people.

2. Regrets of touring—motor troubles, tire trouble, high gas prices. Detours—people like to avoid detours. Evidently not the same is true of spiritual detours on the highway of Life.

3. If Greeks had followed Socrates instead of detour of Epicureanism. If Israel had followed Moses and prophets instead of their Ahab. If Christianity had followed Christ instead of detours of escape from his rigorous code, . . . what might not the world have become by this time? Examine this tendency to mistake detours for the main highway:

I. The Main Highway defined.

1. It is the way by which the loftiest dreams of mankind are realizable. Justice, equality, freedom.

2. For Christians, it is the Kingdom of God.

3. That road that leads to perfection of the spiritual possibilities in man.

Detours may have the above as goals, but lead not to them, but into long byways and pitfalls.

II. Detours of the Past.

1. Roman Imperialism, all the world ruled under the Imperium Romanum.

2. Greek worship of the human body and its instincts and desires.

3. Feudalism, caste system.

4. Rationalism—agnosticism.

III. Earmarks of Detours.

1. New and different. Fads. Appeal to those who tire of old paths.

Example: Children who chafe under discipline of parental home. Nations, tired of kings, found democracies, fail to support them and permit them to degenerate into bureaucracies then embrace dictatorship.

2. Have glitter and gilt. Example—the appeal of new religious cults and sects. False freedom of new morality.

3. Cater to lowest in our nature. Lust, easy power and wealth, luxury, freedom from restraint and the rugged way of the cross.

IV. Detours of today.

1. Measuring worth by the dollar sign instead of by service.

Example: Successful shoemaker, not best maker of shoes, but best manipulator of profit, labor, advertising, etc.

Example: In religion not what is eternally true, but "what will it get me" frequently the standard.

2. Universal Education: that the world will become perfect when most people are schooled. We have said, good education yields a bigger income. Result college people frequently expect soft jobs. Educated men may become leading citizens or cunning fiends. Skill never will supplant character for world-good.

3. False liberalism: in easy morality; letdown of family discipline; spineless religion.

V. Signs of the Highway.

1. Most good for greatest number.
2. Builds on best of the past.
3. Agrees with text, that Jesus is the Way, Truth, and the Life.

Conclusion:

Eye and heart must be kept open lest we waste precious time on detours when we thought we were on the highway. Be forward-looking, yet faithful in church, family, private life.

August 21

Contagious Religion

Proverbs 3: 17.

Introduction:

Text may be taken as measuring stick for joyous religion. Wisdom and religion were closely related in Hebrew mind. Religious life can be pleasant, peaceful, happy. According to text, much which we call religion is counterfeit. Not more religion but better quality needed to make it contagious. Measles and other annoying things of life are contagious. Why is not the good more contagious?

I. Why is not Religion more contagious?

1. Admit that it is not. Irreligious children in homes of church parents. Contrast to eulogy paid Prof. Goodspeed, "To have met him in the morning made the whole day go better."

2. We most frequently have the wrong kind of religion. 57 varieties of pickles, also of religion. Not all will make life of beauty described in text. Judge by fruits if your religion is right.

II. Some of these wrong kinds of religion.

1. Supersanctimonious type. Some religious people chill when you get in contact with them.

2. Formalistic religion. Lacks enthusiasm.

3. Prohibitionist, or negative religion. Religion more than "not doing bad."

4. Moralistic religion. Always questioning the religiousness of other people's actions.

5. Otherworldly. Thinks only of pearly gates and golden sidewalks.

III. How make religion more contagious?

1. Get rid of the wrong kind. Test by text.

2. Make it wholesome by making it winsome.

3. Radiate a full and complete life, enriched by and enriching religion.

4. Avoid unlovely religion,—Pharisaism.

God will forgive us much if we have lived radiant, happy lives, that have contaminated others with the winsomeness of the Master.

August 28

The Inner Compulsion

Jeremiah 31: 33-34. I will write my law in their inward parts, etc.

Introduction:

Jeremiah's day much like ours—many laws on the books, few in the heart. The prophet saw: 1. Day of Israel's destruction; 2. New day when God's will and man's would be united.

Jeremiah can teach us:

I. Ultimate futility of law not written in conscience of people.

1. Failure of legislated goodness.

a. Roman imperialism dream of emperors, but not shared by people.

b. Jewish Legalism with more loopholes than a Swiss cheese.

c. Feudalism.

d. Russian Communism.

e. Italian Fascism.

f. American Prohibition.

All will fail unless they become and remain the inner convictions of the people.

2. Importance of Character and Conscience Education.

a. Example of early Christians. Ananias taught Paul, etc.

b. Russian educational and propaganda system.

c. American ideals will rest on American education. Maintenance of ideals that motivated founding of our republic.

d. Church and Religion. Effective only as one can say "I know in whom I believe." Work of the S. S. Vacation School, Confirmation, etc.

II. Necessity of Inner Compulsion for Kingdom Work.

1. Early success due to "Love of Christ constraineth me."

2. Much more virile religion than "Because we should."

3. How make people want to be active in the kingdom? Methods tried: Church made popular; place for good times; place of fellowship; "Ought"; "Fear"; only effective way—teach love for Kingdom so that men will *want* to work for it. Success determined by amount of inner compulsion.

III. The Promised Day—Missions no longer necessary.

1. What courage and daring of vision the prophets had.

2. Day when knowing the truth is same as following it. Not so now.

3. Day when we walk in the Way Beautiful, not in the Way Must.

IV. Conditions of Forgiveness:

1. Israel's greatness due to God and sin-consciousness. Remained humble.

2. Men must want to serve God, rather than must.

Example: Trout faces current of stream. Men must line up with God.

3. Ability to forgive. Primitive people and animals don't.

Example: Otto the Great great enough to forgive conspiring brother.

Example: from Christ's ministry.

Example: Mother recently forgave murderer of her daughter who committed suicide afterwards. Sent flowers to morgue.

4. Tests of Religion and Culture. The amount of inner compulsion they can create in hearts of people not on size of possessions, armies and navies.

EVANGELICAL STANDARD FOR ADULT CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN THE LOCAL CHURCH

Evangelical Synod of North America

By H. L. Streich, Adult Superintendent

I. The Need of Adult Education

"Why stop learning?" "Continue your education." These are slogans in the educational world today. Classes and extension courses for adults are offered by practically all colleges and universities through the country. "Moonlight" schools have been opened in several mountain states. Thousands of adults are found in the evening sessions of our schools, Y. M. C. A.'s, Y. W. C. A.'s and other institutions in our cities. All this augurs well for continued education after graduation and increased intelligence on the part of our American citizens.

The *Church too* must continue the education—Christian Education—of her adults, her fathers and mothers. She must find ways and means. In the average church the Sunday service and sermon is the only means and method employed. In many of our Evangelical churches it is still the custom to discontinue Sunday school attendance after confirmation. In all churches a large number of members receive no instruction aside from one Sunday sermon a week. A comparatively few read the Church papers.

It is, therefore, encouraging to note that progress is being made in reaching our Evangelical adults with some form of Christian Education.

No department of our Church Schools has increased in the same proportion as has the *Adult Department* including the Home or Extension Department. The number of Evangelical Churches without an Adult Class is decreasing yearly.

Besides this hundreds of our women's and men's societies,—Women's Unions and Brotherhoods—have *a monthly program of education,* the larger number using our official annual "Monthly Program" for women's organizations or "Monthly Activity Program" for men's organizations. These make for definite education. Before long all our adult organizations will use these monthly programs of education.

Furthermore, an increasing number of these adult groups have *Study Classes or Reading Courses on Missions,* Stewardship, Parent Training and other subjects.

Beginning with 1932 a *Women's Union Library* for local societies, similar to Worker's Libraries for Sunday School workers,

is being introduced. Recommended books are bought by society and circulated among the members. (See folder, "Our Women's Union Library.")

Thus adult Christian Education is greatly increasing in our Evangelical Synod.

II. Standard of Adult Christian Education

In the recently issued *"Proposed Standard for Adult Religious Education"* by the Interdenominational Council of Religious Education (twenty cents at Headquarters) will be found a "workable ideal for adult religious education in the local church." We earnestly recommend its prayerful study and careful consideration. Our Board of Religious Education has made it the basis of our Evangelical Standard of Adult Christian Education and urges our pastors and adult leaders to do likewise in their local fields.

III. Objectives of Adult Christian Education

We quote those of above Proposed Standard.

"The final test of the program of religious education is the extent to which it helps people in learning to live the Christian life. This life-centered objective should be kept constantly in mind in evaluating the work of the church school. The test that should be applied is—does it succeed in achieving such AIMS as the following:

The development in men and women of:

1. An increasing *consciousness of God* as a reality in all human experience and sense of personal relationship to him.
2. Increasing *loyalty to Jesus Christ* and to his cause.
3. Continuous *growth in Christian character.*
4. A Christian *interpretation of life* and of the universe as expressing the divine purpose and plan, and a philosophy of life built upon this interpretation.
5. Growing ability and desire to *participate* in and contribute to the building of a Christian community and world.
6. The *progressive assimilation* of the best religious experience of the race as expressed in the Bible, in other religious literature, and in life.
7. Increasingly *effective participation* in the life and work of the church, as the organized society of Christians and the chief agency through which the cause of Jesus is to be advanced."

IV. The Means to Achieve Objectives

1. *A Program* of Study, Worship, Service, Social and Recreational Life.
2. *A Leadership,* consecrated and trained.
3. *Organizations* properly constituted and administered.—

Bible Classes, Home Departments, Women's Societies, Brotherhoods and like groups, coordinated, and programs of study and service and social activities correlated.

4. *Housing and Facilities* for efficient and effective functioning of such adult groups.

V. The Agencies to Be Employed

1. *Adult Bible Classes.*
   a. Sunday Bible Classes in Sunday School.
   b. Week-day Bible Classes afternoons or evenings. Some churches have such on Wednesday evenings, known as "Mid-week Services" or "Church Nights."

More week-day classes for the study of Bible teaching on Christian Living, the Home, Missions, Social and economic problems should be conducted by pastors and adult leaders. The excuse of absence of room or teacher is not tenable here.

2. *Home or Extension Department.* Already over 500 Evangelical churches have such departments. While absence of room or teacher may make an Adult Bible Class on Sunday morning temporarily impossible, no good reason can be given for not having a Home Department which will prove a real blessing to any congregation. (See "Why Not a Home Department?")

3. *Parent Training Classes and Reading Courses.* Once or twice a year every pastor should organize a class on Parent Training. A short course of 8-12 lectures is advised, given in Sunday School or week-day afternoons or evenings, weekly or bi-weekly. Often some qualified person other than the pastor can be secured to lead and direct such parent classes. Throughout the year books on parent training, child life, the Christian home and the like should be recommended and circulated. Here both the Worker's Library of the Church School and the Women's Union Library will be of real service. Headquarters will gladly cooperate in suggesting books and methods.

4. *Women's Organizations*—Ladies' Aids, Women's Unions, Missionary Societies—should all have definite programs of study and service. No regular meeting should be held without a program of Education. Each month should also find the society active in some phase of Kingdom building. The annual "Monthly Program" will be found of inestimable value in preparing and planning such study and service.

5. *Men's Organizations—Brotherhoods* and Men's Clubs. These too should have a *study and service program.* Why allow our men to go to noon-day luncheon and other clubs for their education and service? It is gratifying that the large majority of our Evangelical Men's Organizations are using our annual "Monthly

Activity Program," which contains both an *educational* and *activity program* for each month of the year.

6. *Special Groups of Adults* can be organized for special study of Church Finances, Church Administration, Synodical Activities, Community Problems, Evangelism, Church Music and the like.

In some churches the Council has a training course as part of its regular meeting. The annual "Program of the Evangelical Synod" furnished since 1931 by our Synodical Committee on Promotion offers suitable monthly material for discussion in your Church Council meeting.

VI. Study Material for Adults

1. *For Bible Classes.*
   a. Uniform Lessons.
   b. Evangelical Adult Lesson Series—4 volumes; 52 lessons in each volume—50c.
      Volume 1—Old Testament Studies.
      Volume 2—New Testament Studies.
      Volume 3—Evangelical Principles.
      Volume 4—Studies in Church History.
      (Note: Each volume is complete and can be used separate from the others. We especially recommend 3 and 4.)
   c. *Elective Courses* of three months with text books and pamphlets of 8-12 chapters arranged for group study, with questions and reference material, on subjects like The Christian Home, Prayer, Christian Stewardship, Christian Fundamentals, Apostles' Creed, Social Principles of Jesus, Economic Problems, Peace and War, History and Work of our Synod, Our Missions in India, Honduras or America, Meaning of Service, Social Hygiene, Law Enforcement, Prohibition, Race Relations and the like. Send to Headquarters for a list of Elective Courses giving names of books, pamphlets and prices, Free. We, with adult leaders of other churches, especially recommend elective courses for adult classes.
2. *For Home Department.*
   a. Eden Adult Quarterly.
   b. Das Heim (German Quarterly)
   c. Recommended books and periodicals to be read by members of Home Department.
3. *For Parent Training Classes and Reading Courses.*

The Home and Christian Licing—Hayward. 75c.

The Training of Christians in the Christian Family—Weigle. $1.50.

Parents as Teachers of Christian Living. 15c.

The Mother Teacher of Religion—Betts. $1.50.

Parenthood and Character Training of Children—Galloway. $1.10.

Character Guidance and Occupations for Children—McCallum. $1.00.

4. *For Women's Organizations*—Ladies' Aids, Women's Unions and other Women's Societies.

a. *"The Monthly Program,"* published annually. Topics for each month of year with outline for Open Forum Discussion and Reference Material. These topics are treated one month in advance in the *Evangelical Herald* and *Friedensbote.*

b. *Missionary Books* to be studied or read. Two, one on Home Missions and one on Foreign Missions, recommended each year. The first to be studied or read from September to January, the second from February to June. See folder: "Mission Study Classes," published annually.

c. *Christian Stewardship.* One book recommended each year.

d. *Other Subjects.* From time to time books and pamphlets on other subjects are recommended.

e. *"Women's Union Library."* Every women's society is requested to establish a "Women's Union Library" with books to be loaned to members. See folder "Our Women's Union Library."

5. *For Brotherhoods and Men's Clubs.*

a. *"Monthly Activity Program"* published annually. Topics for each month of year with outline for Open Forum Discussion and Reference Material. The topics are treated one month in advance in the *Evangelical Herald.*

b. *Missionary Books.* Two books, one on Home and one on Foreign recommended each year. Foreign Mission book to be read between September and January; Home Mission book from February to June.

c. *Christian Stewardship.* Book recommended each year to be read any time of year.

d. *Other Subjects.* Books and Pamphlets on other subjects of importance and interest to men are recommended from time to time. Watch church papers and

"Evangelical Men" for announcements. See folder: "Reading Course for Evangelical Men" published annually.

VII. Books and Pamphlets for Study

1. *Devotional Life.*
   a. *The Meaning of Prayer.* Fosdick—$1.35.
   b. *The Meaning of Service.* Fosdick—$1.35.
   c. *Jesus in the Experience of Men.* Glover—$1.50.
   d. *How Jesus Met Life Questions.* Elliott. $0.75.
   e. *Characteristics of Personal Christianity.* Luccock. Teacher's Book 15c—Student's 40c.
2. *Doctrinal.*
   a. *Evangelical Principles.* Vol. III. Adult Lesson Series —50c.
   b. *Evangelical Belief and Doctrine*—$1.00.
   c. *Why I Believe in Religion.* Brown—$1.50.
3. *Bible.*
   a. *Know Thy Bible.* Lehman—30c.
   b. *Apt to Teach,* Parts I, II, III. Bomhard—55c.
   c. *Evangelical Lesson Series,* Vol. I, II.—50c each.
   d. *Our Bible* (Morehouse Press)—$1.00.
   e. *Bible Study by Books.* Sell (Revell) 50c.
   f. *Writings of New Testament.* Vollmer—$1.25.
   g. *The Bible.* 13 Studies—25c.
   h. *Why We Believe the Bible,* Wells—$1.25.
4. *Christian Stewardship.*
   a. *Christian Stewardship.* McConaughy—40c.
   b. *Jesus' Teaching on Use of Money.* Brown—50c.
   c. *Stewardship of All of Life.* Lovejoy—85c.
   d. *The Meaning of Stewardship.* Luccock—40c.
5. *Missions.*
   a. *In the Harvest Field.* Enders. The work of our Synod in America, India and Honduras. 75c.
   b. *Evangelical Synod in India.* Melick. 60c.
   c. *Seed Sowing in Honduras.* Melick. 60c.
   d. *Evangelical Pioneers.* Flucke. 85c.
   e. *The Adventure of the Church.* Cavert. Progress of Church from Pentecost—60c.
6. *Parent Training* (See above)
7. *Church Administration.*
   a. *Church Finances.* Leach—$2.25.
   b. *Not Slothful in Business.* Bosch—$1.75.
   c. *The Way to Win.* Fischer—$1.15.
   d. *Tested Methods for Town and Country Churches.* Brunner—$1.25.

8. *Social Problems.*
   a. *New Testament Sociology.* Vollmer—$2.25.
   b. *Social Principles of Jesus.* Rauschenbusch—$1.15.
   c. *The Christian in Social Relations.* Luccock. Teacher's Book—15c, student's—40c.
   d. *Facing the Crisis.* Eddy—50c.
   e. *Christian Teachings on Social and Economic Questions.* Robinson—$1.00.
   f. *Of One Blood.* Speer—50c.
   g. *National Defence.* Page 15c.
   h. *War, Its Cause, Consequences and Cure.* Page—15c.
9. *Evangelism.*
   a. *The Ministry of Laymen.* Palmer—25c.
   b. *Motives and Methods of Modern Evangelism.* Goodell. $1.00.
   c. *Visitation Evangelism.* Kernahan—$1.25.
10. *Evangelical Synod.*
   a. *Know Thy Church.* Stoerker—30c.
   b. *Evangelical Pioneers.* Flucke—85c.
   c. *Apt to Teach,* Part VII—55c.

Order these books from
Eden Publishing House — St. Louis or Chicago.

VIII. Organizational Material

For organization and promotion of Adult Christian Education in the Local Church the following "Organization Packages" will be found very helpful.

1. On Adult Standard, including "Scoring Manuel"—35c.
2. On Family Devotion—25c.
3. On Adult Bible Classes—25c.
4. On Home Department—25c.
5. On Parent Training—25c.
6. On Women's Organization—25c.
7. On Brotherhood Organization—25c.

Additional copies of this folder may be had at 5c each.

Order from
Rev. H. L. Streich, Adult Superintendent,
Evangelical Synod Building,
1720 Chouteau Ave. — St. Louis, Mo.

THE EDITOR AND THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH*

By J. H. Steger

A union of the Evangelical Synod with the United Lutheran Church seems, in the eyes of our prophetic editor, "doomed to end in disappointment." He is not interested in how far the Synod is to blame for such an eventual outcome. In fact the Synod was not much interested in approaching other church bodies during the last twenty-five years. There was, however, a somewhat private discussion between these two church bodies A. D. 1918. It ended in disappointment not on account of some theological position, but our representatives withdrew as some untactful remarks of property rights were made.

The editor would have rendered some service to his readers if he had made known to them the official attitude of that church-body concerning the organic union of Protestant churches. In view of the widespread discussion concerning the organic union of the Protestant church in America, the United Lutheran church declares:

1. "That we hold the union of Christians in a single organization to be of less importance than the agreement of Christians in the proclamation of the Gospel. We believe that the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church exists through and under divergent forms of external organization. Union of organization we hold, therefore, to be a matter of expediency; agreement in testimony to be a matter of principle.

2. That holding the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments to be primary function of every Church, we believe that a clear definition of what is meant by "Gospel" and "Sacrament" must precede any organic union of the Churches. We believe that a permanent and valid union of Churches must be based upon positive agreements concerning the truth for which the United church Body is to stand. The Churches cannot unite as mere Protestants, but only as confessors.

3. That as a necessary step toward a genuine organic union, we believe that the Protestant Church Bodies in America should endeavor to set forth, definitely and positively, the views of Christian truth for which each of them does now actually stand, in order that by their clear and unequivocal testimony to what they hold to be the truth, the nature and extent of their agreement may become apparent."

---

*The editor had, some time ago, quoted Prof. Neve: "A union between us and the United Lutheran Church not practicable."

As a basis of practical co-operation among Protestant churches the United Lutheran Church states the following points of Christian doctrine:

1. The Fatherhood of God, revealed in His Son Jesus Christ, and the sonship bestowed by God, through Christ, upon all who believe in Him.

2. The true Godhead of Jesus Christ, and His redemption of the world by His life and death and resurrection; and His living presence in His Church.

3. The continued activity of God the Holy Spirit among men, calling them into the fellowship of Jesus Christ, and enlightening and sanctifying them through the gifts of grace.

4. The supreme importance of the Word of God and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as the means through which the Holy Spirit testifies of Christ and thus creates and strengthens faith. (In common with the whole Evangelical Lutheran Church, we confess the mystery of the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and we invite all Christians to a renewed study of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures concerning this Sacrament and the Sacrament of the Holy Baptism.)

5. The authority of the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only rule and standard by which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged.

6. The reality and universality of sin, and the inability of men, because of sin, to attain righteousness or earn salvation through their own character or works.

The love, and the righteousness of God, Who for Christ's sake bestows forgiveness and righteousness upon all who believe in Christ.

8. The present existence upon earth of a kingdom of God, founded by His Son, Jesus Christ, not as an external organization, but as a spiritual reality and object of faith.

9. The hope of Christ's second coming, to be the Judge of the living and the dead, and to complete the kingdom of God."

The prophecy of doom as uttered by the editor is based:

1. Upon a remark made by Dr. Neve that "the Synod has to adopt a Lutheran conception and interpretation of the Lord's supper" before a union can be established. One is almost tempted to ask which of the many Lutheran interpretations has to be accepted? It can be confidently stated that even within the fold of Dr. Neve the desired interpretation was not generally accepted without undergoing some modifications. Our well-known expounder of the Evangelical Catechism, Dr. Irion, mentions in his explanation of the Lord's Supper the influence of its use upon the body. This

was evidently done in the spirit of the realism of Oetinger and others. Dr. Neve finds in these remarks the point of connection for a Lutheran interpretation." It can hardly be contended that such a view would have any great show of success. It may rather be said that European Lutheranism of today has adopted an entirely different interpretation of the Lord's Supper than the Lutheranism of the 18th and 19th century. It accentuates not the glorified body but the sacrificing life of the Lord and it also emphasizes the Lord's Supper as the communio sanctorum and by so doing it gives up the mere private character of the sacrament.

2. "The theological position of the United Lutheran Church is very conservative and orthodox"—If the editor wishes to express the idea that American Lutheranism in general has been tied more strongly to the period of orthodoxy than the sister-church in Europe, he will have the consent of many theologians within the U. L. C. They admit that American Lutheranism has shown an ignorance of modern progress and has not always used the best forms of thought. There has been greater freedom among the European Lutheran theologians than in America. The American seminary education and our loudly acclaimed democracy has not developed an independent interpretation.

But there are many up-to-date theologians within the U. L. C. who do in no way advocate a reactionary attitude in theology or hold a brief for mental stagnation or intellectual isolation as essential to Lutheranism. The Lutherans within the U. L. C. might in turn ask the Evangelical Synod about her contributions to a progressive theology? And they also might ask us whether there is no conservatism and orthodoxy among the brethren who embrace us now for the second time.

3. "Modernism would not be tolerated:" A number of years ago the Evangelical Synod issued a pamphlet for the information of its constituencies. There it was claimed that the Evangelical Synod neither stands for Modernism nor Fundamentalism as those words are usually used. "We are evangelical, nothing more and nothing less," that was the slogan to be heard at our conferences. We are progressively evangelical, modern-positive, as the term is used by a certain theological group of the Fatherland. With almost the same words leading theologians of the United Lutheran Church assure us, that "essential Lutheranism, is neither fundamentalist nor liberalist, but progressively—EVANGELICAL." Lutheranism is not negative but positive. It is not reactionary but progressive. Its better name is EVANGELICAL." A Modernism however which has nothing but—"the bleached Christ, the humanized scriptures, the impotent cross, the empty sacraments and rationalized faith, and the utter inability to bring sinners to

repentance and salvation" shall not be tolerated within the United Lutheran Church. How about the Evangelical Synod?

4. The "Social Gospel" has made only very little headway"—The brother editor will admit that it has not made so much headway within our own fold. A. Wentz, a well-known scholar of the United Lutheran Church, admits the weakness in not emphasizing the Social Gospel. He finds the main cause in the one-sided emphasis of the Reformation. Lutheranism, he says, has to make plain not only the principle of liberty but also the principle of obligation. The whole life of each man, he says is vitalized by the religious principle, not only his relation with God but all his relations with his fellow-men. It would make an end of the thin air of sentimental emotionalism and it would not divorce the social order from the heart of the Gospel.

In fact Lutheranism senses a distinct mission for the twentieth century. Calvinism which had such a great chance to clothe our American civlization with vital religion has "in a large measure accommodated itself and secularized its religious instinct. In fact, there is a wide circle of scholarship which claims that Calvinism is responsible for the very essence of our capitalistic and materialistic civilization. It had control of the field when the gulf between capitalism and personal religion in our country began to open. And it stood by and has watched the gulf widen, and today it looks on, powerless to bridge the chasm."

This is without doubt a onesided aspect of the present social situation. But there is a great truth in it. Every true Evangelical will rejoice if the Lutheran church of America sees her district mission in our day—in "an incisive preachment of genuine vitalizing religion of the heart that redeems the whole man, soul, mind, and body and sanctifies his every relationship." It sounds promising and courageous if Dr. Wentz rings out the message to the United Lutheran Church. "If Lutheranism can be brought to realize its responsibility to the whole round of human life it can remain true to its essential genius, and deliver a message that will make a paramount contribution in solving the most serious problem of modern times. That message has not yet been delivered. Lutheranism has not yet fulfilled its mission to modern times."

Die Betätigung des christlichen Charakters gegenüber der Kirche.

Von Prof. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

I.

Der christliche Charakter ist stets auch ein **kirchlicher Charakter** in dem Sinn, daß er nicht ohne Kirche entstanden ist und ohne sie nicht bestehen kann. Darum gehört es zu seinen sittlichen Pflichten, sich auch mit und für die Kirche zu betätigen. Die Kirche, deren dogmatisches Verständnis ebenso wie das der Gnadenmittel schon in früheren Aufsätzen dieser Zeitschrift entwickelt wurde, ist die Gemeinschaft der Menschen, welche durch Wort und Sakrament Glaube und Liebe empfangen haben. Infolgedessen hat der Christ diese Mittel stets von Neuem auf sich wirken zu lassen. **Er wird daher das Wort sich in der ihm zugänglichsten und packensten Form immer wieder aneignen.** Diese muß auch für den evangelischen Christen durchaus nicht immer nur das Bibelwort in seiner authentisch-geschichtlichen Form sein. Der einfache Christ wird sich zunächst an der Predigt erbauen, die ihm eine Uebersetzung, Erklärung und Anwendung des biblischen Wortes auf seine Zeit und Verhältnisse bringt. Er wird sodann zum Gesangbuch oder zu Gebetbüchern greifen, die sich in seiner Familie und Gemeinschaft eines langen und erfolgreichen Gebrauches erfreuen. Kinder erleben die heilige Geschichte am wirksamsten in der Erzählung ihrer Mutter, mag diese auch manchen geschichtlichen Zug fortlassen oder einen legendarischen hinzufügen. Erwachsene können tief religiös gepackt und gefördert werden durch christliche Erzählungen oder Biographien hervorragender Persönlichkeiten aus der Kirchengeschichte. Auch religiöse Bilder oder Figuren können Gnadenmittel in diesem weiteren Sinn werden. Jeder greife darum zu den Formen, die sein Christentum am sichersten und kräftigsten stärken. Gerade wer das tut und sich in den lebendigen Strom der kirchlichen Verkündigung einstellt, wird dann den Weg zurück zu ihrer Quelle, der **Bibel** finden. In ihr wird er sich zunächst den ihm schon religiös erschlossenen Abschnitten zuwenden. Der alte Hallenser Professor Tholuck hat einmal aus zutreffender Beobachtung des wirklichen Lebens gesagt: „Die meisten Menschen werden durch die großgedruckten Sprüche in der Bibel selig." In der Tat trifft unwillkürlich der christliche Charakter eine Auswahl aus der heiligen Schrift und stellt sich eine bestimmte Zahl von Geschichten und Worten zusammen, deren Kraft er in besonderen Lebenslagen erfahren hat und zu denen er darum immer wieder greift. Es wäre ein Rückfall in einen gesetzlichen Gebrauch der

Bibel, wenn man von jedem Christen verlangte, daß er alle Teile sich in gleicher Weise aneignen solle. Wie die Kirche in ihren Gottesdiensten durch das Perikopensystem bezeugt, daß für die religiöse Erbauung bestimmte wiederkehrende Abschnitte der Schrift am wirksamsten sind, genau so hat der einzelne christliche Charakter sich aus der gesamten Bibel ein persönliches Erbauungsbuch zusammen zu stellen. Er wird es im Lauf seines religiösen Lebens stetig zu erweitern suchen, aber doch niemals den vollen Umfang der Schrift innerlich erreichen. Denn die Bibel ist für die Kirche aller Zeiten und aller Orte bestimmt und geht darum auch über den Horizont des gefördertsten Christen hinaus.

Mit dem Wort hängen die **Sakramente** auf das Engste zusammen. So gewiß sie in besonderm Maß göttliche Gaben sind und objektiven Charakter tragen und darum religiös im Glauben angeeignet sein wollen, hat der Christ auch ihnen gegenüber eine sittliche Betätigung zu üben. Der Taufe in der Form der Kindertaufe, kann sich der Christ nur so zuwenden, daß er sich ihrer Absicht im Lauf seines Lebens immer wieder zu bemächtigen sucht. Will sie den Christen versichern, daß Gottes Gnade allem seinem Handeln voraus geht und dauernd seiner individuellen Persönlichkeit gilt, so hat sich der Christ auf sie zu stützen, wenn er an dem Erfolg des eigenen Wirkens zweifelt und den Mut verloren hat, sich von Abwegen zu Gott zurückzufinden. Die Taufe wird aber auch ein dauerndes sittliches Motiv für die Menschen, auch ihrerseits in Dankbarkeit die Bundesverpflichtung gegenüber Gott zu erfüllen. Wird im Abendmahl die Gemeinschaft mit dem in den Heilstod gegangenen lebendigen Christus vermittelt, so hat der Christ bei seinem Empfang die inneren Stimmungen der Reue und des Glaubens zu erwecken und durch sie sich schon auf den Empfang des Sakramentes vorzubereiten. Die Häufigkeit des Abendmahlsbesuches wird inneren Bedarf und kirchliche Sitte in Freiheit miteinander verbinden.

Werden die Gnadenmittel vornehmlich bei dem **Gemeindegottesdienste** dem Christen zugänglich, so wird er jenen frei und freudig besuchen. Luther hat zwar einmal den Gedanken geäußert, daß ein vollkommener Christ auf den Besuch des Gottesdienstes verzichten könne, weil er unmittelbar und individuell mit Gott verkehre. Aber er hat doch zugleich hinzugefügt, daß der empirische Christ der Stärkung durch die gottesdienstliche Gemeinschaft bedarf, wie er seinerseits dem Nächsten zu dem gleichen Zweck Anwesenheit schuldig ist. **Gehört mithin gottesdienstliche Betätigung zu den sittlichen Aufgaben des christlichen Charakters, so hat dieser sein ethisches Interesse auch auf die Erhaltung, Reinigung, Umgestaltung der gottesdienstlichen Formen zu richten.** Diese haben sich

im Lauf der Geschichte erst allmählich in mannigfaltiger Gestalt herausgebildet. Die Lutherische Kirche hat zu einem guten Teil die katholische Liturgie übernommen, aber aus ihr unbiblische Gedanken, wie die unblutige Wiederholung des blutigen Opfers im Meßkanon ausgeschaltet. Auch die Gegenwart hat noch ein Recht Aenderungen vorzunehmen; denn alle gottesdienstliche Formen sind wie ein berühmter Streit in der Reformationszeit im Jahre 1548 festgestellt hat, Adiaphora d. h. sittlich religiös neutrale Gebilde. Wirkt etwa eine altertümliche Sprache in Gebeten und Gesängen auf Menschen der Gegenwart abstoßend, so ist ihre Erneuerung in der für unsre Zeit wirksamsten Form sittliche Pflicht. Verbirgt sich aber unter dem Deckmantel formaler Erneuerung der Wunsch, den Inhalt des alten Evangeliums zu beseitigen, dann wird die größte Vorsicht und Zurückhaltung zu beobachten sein. Von diesem prinzipiellen Standpunkt aus läßt sich ohne weiteres zu neuauftauchenden Reformvorschlägen gottesdienstlicher oder kirchlicher Sitten Stellung nehmen. Vor einigen Jahren wurde hier und da die Einführung eines **Einzelkelches** statt des gemeinsamen beim Abendmahl propagiert. Auch im Einzelkelch könnte das Blut Jesu Christi empfangen werden, und, wenn es wirklich der Fall sein sollte, daß mit seiner Einführung der Abendmahlsbesuch — durch Forträumung hygienischer Bedenken — erheblich gefördert würde, wäre die Aenderung der alten Sitte und die Einführung der neuen sittlich unbedenklich. Würde dagegen durch eine solche Maßnahme der Kreis der regelmäßigen Abendmahlsbesucher beunruhigt und der Eindruck hervorgerufen, daß mit dem Fortfall des einen Kelches die religiöse Gemeinschaft und Gleichheit gemindert wird, so hat die Kirche einer solchen Neuerung zu widerstreben.

Mit der gleichen Unbefangenheit ist auch die in den letzten Jahrzehnten hervorgetretene Frage nach der **christlichen Bestattungsform** zu prüfen. Christliche Sitte war bisher von den Anfängen an das Begräbnis, das durch die Tatsache des Begräbnisses Jesu besonders geweiht ist. In neuerer Zeit haben sich weitere Kreise für die Feuerbestattung eingesetzt und zwar haben diese zunächst meist nicht nur gegen die kirchliche Sitte, sondern auch gegen die bei ihr bezeugten Glaubensvorstellungen Front gemacht. Einer solchen Stellungnahme gegenüber hat sich die Kirche mit Recht ablehnend verhalten und wirklich stichhaltige Gründe für die Aenderung ihrer Bestattungsform gefordert. Liegen solche vor — etwa in der Raumnot der großen Städte für Friedhöfe — und wird die Feuerbestattung zu einer religiös-neutralen Handlung, dann hat die Kirche keinen Anlaß sich ihr prinzipiell zu widersetzen. Denn selbst der kräftigste Glaube an die Auferstehung des Fleisches ruht nicht auf der Erdbestattung, die ja auch auf die Dauer alle Elemente

menschlicher Körperlichkeit auflöst. Zudem sind auch zahlreiche Märtyrer und andre Christen im Feuer zu Grund gegangen, die gewiß nicht darum für die Auferweckung verloren sind. Die göttliche Allmacht ist jeder Form der Zerstörung menschlicher Körperlichkeit gewachsen. Praktisch haben darum in letzter Zeit eine ganze Anzahl protestantischer Gemeinschaften die Feuerbestattung mit der Erdbestattung für gleichmöglich erklärt und vollziehen darum auch bei der ersteren alle kirchlichen Zeremonien.

Zu der kirchlichen Sitte gehört auch die Festsetzung eines besonderen Feiertages, des **Sonntags. Er ist nicht die Fortführung des Sabbats und darum nicht ein göttliches Gebot.** Diesen haben allerdings Jesus und die Apostel noch gefeiert, aber mit einer solchen Freiheit, daß gerade hier der Unterschied zwischen Judentum und Christentum, gesetzlicher Gebundenheit und evangelischer Freiheit zum Ausdruck kam. Der Sonntag hat sich als eine christliche Sitte vollkommen selbständig und erst allmählich entwickelt. Von ihr können wir die ersten Spuren im neuen Testament beobachten, so in 1. Kor. 16, 2, wo von der Gewohnheit die Rede ist, am ersten Tag nach dem Sabbath die Kollekte für die Brüder zu sammeln, so Offb. 1, 10 und 20, 7, wo die Anrufung Gottes am „Herrentag" berichtet wird. Diese Benennung weist deutlich auf den Ursprung des Sonntages hin zur Erinnerung an die an ihm erfolgte Auferstehung des Herrn. Dieser rein geschichtlich begründete christliche Feiertag wurde verhältnismäßig bald wieder mit dem Sabbatsgedanken verbunden. Eine gesetzliche Auffassung vom Sonntag herrschte in der alten und in der mittelalterlichen Kirche. Die Reformation brach mit ihr deutlich schon Augustana 28, besonders eingehend und klar Luther in der Erklärung des dritten Gebotes in seinem Großen Katechismus. Es kommt durchaus nicht auf den Tag an, nur aus geschichtlichen und praktischen Gründen bleibt man beim Sonntag: „Weil aber von altersher der Sonntag dazu gestellt ist, soll man's auch dabei bleiben lassen, auf daß es in einträchtiger Ordnung gehe und niemand eine Unordnung mache." Der Zweck des Sonntags ist einmal der gemeinsame Gottesdienst; an ihm soll man sich „Raum und Zeit nehmen, Gottesdienst zu warten, Gottes Wort zu hören und handeln." Mit dem Sonntag ist aus praktischen Gründen der für die Menschen nötige Ruhetag verbunden, der aber durchaus nicht ängstlich bewahrt werden soll: „Daß das Feiern nicht so enge gespannet, daß darum andre zufällige Arbeit, so man nicht umgehen kann, verboten wäre."

Diese Auffassung wurde auch von Calvin und der ersten reformierten Kirche geteilt. In sie drang erst später wieder das gesetzliche Verständnis ein und setzte sich besonders in der englischen Kirche durch, die ihrerseits wieder den Kontinent und Amerika beeinflußte.

Anfangs des 19. Jahrhunderts setzte eine Besinnung auf die reformatorische Anschauung ein und drang in immer weitere Kreise. Sie kann in den Sätzen zusammengefaßt werden: **Die sittlich religiöse Bedeutung des Sonntags besteht in der Ermöglichung des Gemeindegottesdienstes, sowie solcher Betätigungen des Glaubens und der Liebe, zu denen die berufliche Arbeit der Woche keine Zeit läßt. Mit dem Sonntag ist aus praktischen Gründen der Ruhetag verbunden, dessen die menschliche Natur bedarf. Die Arbeitsruhe ist nur in dem Maß sittlich notwendig, wie sie der religiös-soziale Zweck für die eigene Persönlichkeit und die Gesamtheit erfordert.**

II.

Die Kirche ist nicht nur der Kreis derjenigen Menschen, die sich um Wort und Sakrament in gläubiger Feier sammeln, sondern auch die Gemeinschaft derer, welche durch die Gnadenmittel die **Kirche erhalten und verbreiten.** Auch an dieser Aufgabe hat sich jeder christliche Charakter zu beteiligen. Wer eine Wahrheitsüberzeugung besitzt, sucht diese auch andern zugänglich zu machen; das ist nicht möglich ohne Ablehnung und Verdrängung entgegenstehender Ueberzeugung. **Alle Wahrheit ist intolerant, auch die christliche.** Diese Behauptung klingt fanatisch und unethisch und es ist auch nicht zu leugnen, daß die christliche Kirche im Lauf ihrer empirischen Geschichte die Verbreitung des Evangeliums und die Bekämpfung fremder Meinungen in unethischer Weise vollzogen hat. Darum ist es notwendig, sittlich berechtigte und unsittliche Intoleranz klar zu unterscheiden. Vollkommene religiöse Toleranz in dem Sinn, daß man jeden nach seiner Façon selig werden läßt, ist nur für den möglich, der selbst keine bestimmte religiöse Wahrheitsüberzeugung hat. Ist jemand der Ueberzeugung, daß alle Religionen und Konfessionen gleich wertvoll beziehungsweise gleich wertlos sind, so hat er natürlich keinen Anlaß, für eine bestimmte einzutreten und eine entgegengesetzte zu verwerfen. Nach Lessings Meinung besaß keine der großen Weltreligionen mehr die echte Wahrheit; darum konnte er Christentum, Judentum, Mohammedanismus auf eine Stufe stellen. Aber derselbe Lessing, der religiös so tolerant war, war auf den Gebieten der Kunst besonders der Theaterkritik einer der intolerantesten Menschen und schärfsten Polemiker. Denn in diesen Sphären glaubte er sich im Besitz absoluter Wahrheiten und hielt sich darum für berechtigt, entgegengesetzte Meinungen mit größter Energie zu verwerfen. **Jeder Mensch ist in der Sphäre intolerant, in der er eine wirkliche Ueberzeugung hat. Dieser Naturnotwendigkeit entsprechend müssen und dürfen auch religiös überzeugte Menschen für ihren Glauben Propaganda unter Ablehnung entgegenstehender Meinungen machen.** Je tiefer ein Mensch von der Richtigkeit seines Glaubens und dessen Bedeutsam-

keit für die ganze Welt überzeugt ist, desto energischer wird er seine Mission vertreten. Ist das Christentum für seine Anhänger die absolute Wahrheit, so wird der christliche Charakter eine absolute Verpflichtung für ihre Vertretung als sittliche Aufgabe empfinden.

Unethisch wird ihre Lösung erst in dem Augenblick, wo sie falsche Mittel anwendet und sich unrichtige Ziele stellt. Ist es die einzige Aufgabe kirchlicher Propaganda, Glaube und Liebe d. h. innerliche religiös-ethische Tugenden herzustellen, so kommt als einzig entsprechendes Mittel das Wort und seine rein geistige Anbietung in Betracht. Ebenso dürfen entgegenstehende religiöse Ueberzeugungen nur durch geistige Kritik abgelehnt werden. Jeder äußere Zwang, jedes Gewaltmittel physischer Art, wie es etwa Karl d. Gr. bei der Unterwerfung der Sachsen unter das Christentum anwandte, aber auch die Inquisition gegenüber den Ketzern im Mittelalter, wie der nicht fehlende Zwang protestantischer Obrigkeiten gegen ihre Untertanen, sind ethisch nicht vertretbar. **Der christliche Charakter tritt für die christliche Wahrheit positiv und negativ entschieden ein, aber nur mit dem ihrem Wesen entsprechenden Mittel des Wortes.**

Diese Verwertung des Wortes im Interesse der Erhaltung und Verbreitung der Kirche gewinnt verschiedene Formen, je nach der Eigenart der Menschen, an die sie sich wendet. Kennen jene das Christentum überhaupt noch nicht, so tritt die **äußere Mission** in Wirksamkeit, sind sie dem Christentum innerlich entfremdet, so beginnt die **innere Mission** besonders in der Gestalt der eindringlichen Wortverkündigung als Evangelisation ihre Tätigkeit; handelt es sich um Schwierigkeiten des persönlichen Lebens, so sucht die individuelle **Seelsorge** zu helfen. Die Jugend führt der **Religionsunterricht** und der **Kindergottesdienst** in die Gemeinschaft der Kirche ein. Alle diese Tätigkeiten in ihrer besonderen Eigenart beschreibt die praktische Theologie. Die Beteiligung an ihnen gestaltet sich verschieden, je nach der Stellung welche der Einzelne in der christlichen Gemeinschaft einnimmt. **Nach evangelischen Grundsätzen hat jeder christliche Charakter die Pflicht, sich irgendwie an diesen verschiedenen Formen des kirchlichen Dienstes zu beteiligen.** Luther fordert die „mutua consolatio fratrum" d. h. gegenseitige Seelsorge; er will, daß ein Hausvater seiner Familie das Wort verkündet. Durch den Bestand eines besonderen kirchlichen Amtes soll nur die regelmäßige und geordnete Uebung aller Wortverkündigung gesichert, nicht aber die Gemeinde von ihr entlastet werden. Am Unterricht der Kinder und auch an der Evangelisation sind in fast allen evangelischen Gemeinschaften sogenannte Laien beteiligt; es besteht aber auch kein Grund, warum in nichtchristlichen Ländern dort wohnende christliche Kaufleute sich nicht an der äußeren Mis-

sion beteiligen sollen. Ja man kann auch ernstlich erwägen, ob nicht jeder Christ, der ja zur Nottaufe berechtigt ist, auch die Spendung der Taufe und des Abendmahls vornehmen kann, wenn das kirchliche Amt aus irgend welchem Grund verhindert ist.

Der **religiöse Unterricht der Jugend** ist in den verschiedensten Zeiten und Ländern der evangelischen Kirche in wechselnder Form erteilt worden. Die frühere Unterordnung des gesamten Schulwesens unter die Kirche hat auch in Deutschland aufgehört und zwar, wie wir meinen, nicht zum Schaden der Kirche. Die Schule ist zu einer selbständigen Macht geworden. Auch der Religionsunterricht ist nach der Neuordnung der staatlichen Verhältnisse in Deutschland nicht mehr in allen Schulgattungen obligatorisch. Wo er aber erteilt wird, muß er im Geist des geschichtlichen und kirchlichen Christentums gegeben werden. Das Recht dieser Forderung steht in erster Linie dem christlichen Elternhaus zu, das zu bestimmen hat, in welchem Geist und vor allen Dingen, in welcher Religion ihre Kinder zu erziehen sind. Es ist aber auch möglich, daß die weltlichen Schulen auf den Religionsunterricht verzichten und dieser dann von den betreffenden religiösen Gemeinschaften ganz in ihrem Sinn erteilt wird, wie es in den vielen außerdeutschen und außereuropäischen Ländern der Fall ist. **Auch in der Frage des Religionsunterrichts kann die evangelische Kirche die größte Beweglichkeit zeigen, denn es kommt nur darauf an, daß die Jugend in wirksamer Weise mit dem Christentum bekannt wird und dabei die jeweiligen Verhältnissen berücksichtigt werden.**

Die Kirche ist im Lauf ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung genötigt worden, ihrer Wahrheitsüberzeugung bestimmte feste Formulierungen zu geben, besonders zur Abwehr gegen eindringende Irrtümer und Verfälschungen; sie hat **Dogma** und **Bekenntnisse** geschaffen, die hier nur unter dem Gesichtspunkt der ethischen Betätigung des christlichen Charakters ihnen gegenüber interessieren. Sind Dogma und Bekenntnis geschichtlich notwendige Formen der christlichen Wahrheit, so darf der einzelne Christ nicht ihre Beseitigung fordern, sondern er hat sie sich vielmehr innerlich anzueignen. Er muß die religiösen Motive verstehen, die etwa in der Zeit der alten Kirche das Dogma von der Gottheit Christi zur Sicherung gegen seine heidnische Herabminderung auf die Stufe der Halbgötter schufen. Der evangelische Christ muß einsehen, daß die Reformation die Rechtfertigungslehre so scharf und exklusiv formulierte, um den Charakter des Christentums als Erlösungsreligion gegenüber der Gesetzesreligion zu sichern. Trotz dieser prinzipiell positiven Stellung zum Dogma der Kirche ist es doch möglich, daß ihm einzelne Lehren innerlich fremd bleiben. Auch ihnen gegenüber wird der christliche Charakter eine abwartende und pietätvolle Stellung ein-

nehmen. Kennt die evangelische Kirche kein unfehlbares Dogma und haben alle seine Formulierungen auch eine Zeitgeschichtliche und vergängliche Seite, so kann sich auch der Christ um eine Umformulierung der Dogmen bemühen. Beobachtet er, wie alte unverständliche Formulierungen eine lebendige Erfassung des Evangeliums in der Gegenwart hindern, so darf er für eine Aenderung eintreten. Eine solche ist allerdings nicht möglich ohne genaue Kenntnis der Vergangenheit, wie der Gegenwart. Im vollen Umfang wird sie nur der besitzen, der sich beruflich über diese Fragen orientiert d. h. der Theologe. **Die Beurteilung des vorhandenen und die Vorbereitung eines neuen Dogmas und Bekenntnisses ist in erster Linie der wissenschaftlichen Theologie anempfohlen. Diese darf aber nicht ein Monopol beanspruchen und die Gemeinde von der Mitarbeit ausschließen.** Denn letztlich sind auch alle theologisch-dogmatischen Entscheidungen positiver und negativer Art religiös bedingt und darum ist auch schlichten christlichen Charakteren ein Urteil möglich. Die Gemeinde muß sogar gegen eine Lehrwillkür des einzelnen Theologen oder Pfarrers gesichert werden. Darum kann die Notwendigkeit eines **Lehrprozesses** eintreten. Dieser darf aber nicht den Charakter eines Ketzerprozesses tragen, der den Beschuldigten auch menschlich und sittlich verurteilt und schädigt. Denn man kann auch mit gutem Gewissen irren und subjektiv ein vortrefflicher Mensch bei abweichender Lehrüberzeugung bleiben. Dieser Tatbestand darf auf der andern Seite aber die Kirche nicht hindern, über der rechten Lehre zu wachen. Einer Lösung dieser Schwierigkeiten dürfte die vor wenigen Jahren in der altpreußischen Kirche getroffene Neuordnung der Lehrprozesse nahekommen. Ein besonderes Spruchgericht, das sich streng von einem Disziplinargericht für persönliche Vergehen unterscheidet, hat nur festzustellen, ob die vorgetragene Lehre, sich mit dem Bekenntnis der Kirche noch deckt. Ist das nicht der Fall, so wird die Lehrgewalt entzogen, ohne die betreffende Persönlichkeit als sittlich minderwertig hinzustellen.

Die christliche Kirche zerfällt in **Konfessionen,** sodaß der christliche Charakter nicht nur ein kirchlicher, sondern auch ein konfessioneller ist. Die ethische Stellung des Christen zu einer Konfession wird sich analog der zum Dogma gestalten. Der evangelische Charakter wird allerdings einer andern Kirche durchaus nicht jeden Wahrheitsbesitz absprechen und damit die Fähigkeit, auch ihrerseits zum Ziel des Christentums zu führen. Für sich persönlich wird er allerdings urteilen, daß für ihn der gottgewollte Weg zur Wahrheit in seiner Kirche gegeben ist. In besonderen Fällen kann diese Gewißheit erschüttert werden und die Meinung entstehen, daß in einer andern Kirche sich das religiöse Leben ungehemmter und erfolg-

reicher vollzieht. Hält diese Ueberzeugung ernstlicher Prüfung stand, so ist **Konfessionswechsel Recht und Pflicht.** Unethisch ist dieser, wenn er aus rein äußeren Motiven etwa der Rücksicht auf Familienverbindungen oder im Hinblick auf eine bessere Karriere erfolgt. Unerfreuliche Züge gewinnt er auch, wenn er sich mit Gehässigkeit oder auch nur einer Herabsetzung der eigenen früheren religiösen Gemeinschaft verbindet.

Hat die Gemeinde das sittliche Recht, das Gehalt ihres Pastors zu kürzen?

Von Pastor G. Fr. Schuetze, S. T. D.

Die Frage nach dem Recht der Gemeinde, das Gehalt ihres Pastors herabzusetzen, ist ja leider in der gegenwärtigen Zeit eine sehr aktuelle geworden. Es ist in hunderten von Gemeinden geschehen, daß des Pastors meist ohnehin nur sehr kärglicher Lohn noch weiter reduziert ist. Das erregt naturgemäß die Frage: Ja, hat denn die Gemeinde wirklich das Recht dazu? Ich rede nicht von dem juristischen Recht. Das hat sie, oder nimmt es sich wenigstens. Dem stehen wir Prediger absolut machtlos gegenüber; denn, heißt es, willst du für den geringeren Lohn nicht arbeiten, so ist es dir unverwehrt, dich nach einer andern Gemeinde umzusehen, die einen dir zusagenden Lohn bewährt. Aber die große Frage bleibt damit ungelöst: Hat die Gemeinde das **sittliche** Recht dazu? Kann sie damit vor Gottes Thron bestehen?

Die Heilige Schrift sagt, daß ein Arbeiter seines Lohnes wert ist. Ferner, daß die, welche das Evangelium predigen, sich auch vom Evangelium nähren sollen, und endlich, daß wer die Seinen nicht versorgt, den Glauben verleugnet hat und ärger denn ein Heide ist. (Cf. 1. Tim. 5, 18; 1. Cor. 9, 14; 1. Tim. 5, 8.) In diesen drei Sätzen liegen die Richtlinien für die Betrachtung der Frage nach dem sittlichen Recht eines Gehaltabbaus. Der Prediger ist ein Arbeiter. Daß er mit dem Herzen und dem Kopf arbeitet anstatt mit den Fäusten, ändert nichts an der Tatsache, daß er als ein Arbeiter ein sittliches Anrecht hat, für seine Arbeit einen entsprechenden Lohn und auskömmliches Gehalt zu beanspruchen. Wird ihm der vorenthalten, dann finden wir eine Sünde, die zum Himmel schreit. (Jak. 5, 4.) Oder soll der Prediger während der Woche sich in einem weltlichen Beruf betätigen und dann so nebenbei am Sonntag predigen? Das kann nur eine Person verlangen, die von der Arbeit des Predigers nur den äußerlichen Akt der Sonntagspredigt kennt, ein Mensch, der einstimmt in das törichte Gerede, daß der Prediger nur des Sonntags eine halbe Stunde arbeitet und dafür mehr bezieht als die, welche an sechs Tagen der Woche 8 bis 10 Stunden hart arbeiten müssen. Es liegt mir ferne, hier Beispiele anzuführen; alle Leser des Magazins haben ja die Erfahrung schon oft am eigenen Leib machen müssen. Es sei genug, darauf hinzuweisen, daß in so vielen Fällen die „eine Wurzel alles Uebels," der schändlichste Geiz, die Ursache der Gehaltskürzung ist. Eine Tatsache, die zu denken gibt, ist, daß gerade die ärgsten Schreier, die nicht genug reden können von der Not der Gemeinde, wie des einzelnen, es doch sich selber an *nichts* abgehen lassen. Merkwürdigerweise sind

es nicht die Gemeinden in den großen Städten, die am meisten klagen, sondern die Landgemeinden, die doch am allerwenigsten Ursache haben, zu klagen. Der Landmann hat wenigstens das tägliche Brot und sein Heim dazu. Er leidet nicht unmittelbare Not wie der Tagelöhner und Handwerker in der Stadt, der „vis a vis du rien" steht, sowie er seine Arbeit verliert.

Wir wiederholen die Frage: Hat eine solche Gemeinde das sittliche Recht, das Pastorengehalt abzubauen? Die Antwort möge sich ein jeder Leser selber geben. Ganz anders aber steht die Sachlage, wenn eine wirkliche Notlage vorliegt. Zum Beispiel eine Bank, die das Geld einer Gemeinde verwaltet, in der die Gemeindeglieder ihre Ersparnisse niedergelegt haben, schließt ihre Tür. Dann mag nun eine wirkliche Notlage eintreten. Die Gemeinde versucht ihr Bestes; sie beschneidet alle sonstigen Ausgaben, besonders die persönlichen, läßt nicht das Gemeinde- und Synodalbudget das erste sein, was sie verkürzt, sondern erst das allerletzte, — und doch will es nirgends hinreichen. Hat sie da das Recht, ihrem Seelsorger zuzumuten, mit ihr die Not der Zeit zu tragen? Gewiß, unter gewissen Bedingungen, und kein Diener Gottes, der nicht ein Mietling ist, wird sich des weigern. Wir können wie Paulus satt sein und hungern (Phil. 4, 12). Aber, wie gesagt, nur unter gewissen Bedingungen, nur wenn eine wirkliche Notlage vorliegt. Die Gemeinde zieht dem Pastor 200, 300, ja vielleicht auch 500 Dollars vom Gehalt ab. Ist es recht, dem Pastor zuzumuten, was man selbst nicht tun will. Ein solcher Abzug bedeutet doch, daß der Pastor im Jahre 200 bis 500 Dollars in die Gemeindekasse zahlen soll. Tun die Gemeindeglieder, die in gleicher Lebenslage stehen, nun auch etwa dasselbe? Gott behüte, vielmehr ist ja jetzt nicht so viel Gehalt zusammenzubringen, folglich brauchen sie auch nicht so viel zu zahlen; folglich zahle ich nicht mehr $3 das Jahr, sondern nur noch $2.75. (Historisch.) Prinzipiell erkennen wir ohne Weiteres es an, daß es Umstände geben mag, die die Gemeinde zwingen, ihre Ausgaben zurückzuschneiden. Aber dann soll man den Gerechtigkeitssinn haben, nicht die ganze Last einem einzelnen Mann auflegen zu wollen, sondern alle sollen gleichmäßig der Zeiten Last tragen. Aber eine solche Gehaltsreduktion sollte nur in den allerschlimmsten Notlagen von einer Gemeinde vorgenommen werden, die es vor Gott und Menschen bezeugen kann, daß sie wirklich nicht besser tun kann. „Ultra posse nemo obligatur." Wenn es ans Hungern gehen soll, weshalb soll da der Pastor es allein tun? Ist er etwa der Stellvertreter der Gemeinde, der an ihrer Statt und in ihrem Namen die Not tragen soll? Solches stellvertretendes Leiden des Predigers ist unsittlich, unrecht, widergöttlich. Und noch eins: Nur diejenige Gemeinde hat das Recht, in Notzeiten das Pastorgehalt zu verrin-

gern, die auch in Prosperitätszeiten ihren Seelsorger an ihrem Wohlergehen beteiligt. Als im Krieg der Bushel Weizen $2 kostete, hat die Gemeinde da gesagt: Es geht uns so gut, daß wir den Pastor an unserm Reichtum und Wohlergehen teilnehmen lassen müssen und wollen? Nein. Dann also hat die Gemeinde auch nicht das Recht, wenn es ihr wirklich schlecht geht, dem Pastor abzuziehen.

Im großen und ganzen müssen wir also die sittliche Berechtigung der Gemeinde bestreiten, als Ersparnismaßregel den Pastor leiden zu lassen. Aber was nützt es zu klagen? Die Frage ist: Kann kein Mittel gefunden werden, den Pastor vor solcher unberechtigter Willkür der Gemeinde sicher zu stellen? Meines Erachtens kann das nur geschehen durch eine fundamentale Aenderung der Organisation und Konstitution der Synode. **Die Synode soll den Pastor anstellen und bezahlen,** sodaß die Gemeinde nicht mehr ihren Pastor direkt bezahlt, sondern auf dem Umweg über die Synode. Das ist eine Maßregel, die ich schon immer vertreten und empfohlen habe. Sie hätte folgende Konsequenzen:

1. Regelmäßige Gehaltsauszahlung. Die Gemeinden werden sich scheuen, die Synode warten zu lassen, wo sie den Pastor, ihren Knecht (???) nach Willkür mißhandeln.

2. In Notzeiten leiden alle Prediger prozentual, nicht daß der eine in Fülle lebt und der andre Not leidet. In Fällen, wann das Gehalt der Pastorenschaft nicht zusammengebracht werden kann, müßten eben alle Pastoren die gleichen prozentualen Abzüge leiden.

3. Dieses System würde auch dem Jagen nach großen Gemeinden ein Ende machen. Ein älterer Mann würde sich recht gern mit einer kleineren Gemeinde zufrieden geben, wäre es nicht um die Gehaltseinbuße, die ein Wechsel in eine kleine Gemeinde mit sich bringt, wenn

4. Die Pastoren nach den Dienstjahren bezahlt werden. Der Anfänger soll mit einem Minimallohn anfangen, der alle fünf Jahre und nach einer Zeit vielleicht auch alljährlich steigt. Die Pensionskasse hat dieses System. Dort hat es sich bewährt; warum sollte es sich nicht auch in einer Gehaltskasse bewähren?

Freilich weiß ich recht wohl, daß ein solcher Systemwechsel seine großen Schwierigkeiten einschließt. Mancher wird ohne Weiteres sagen: Das geht nicht. Aber es geht doch. Wenn ich nicht irre, sind es die Albrechtsbrüder, die auch dieses System haben, und da geht es. Warum nicht bei uns? Ich behalte mir vor, gelegentlich auf diese Schwierigkeiten in einem weiteren Aufsatz einzugehen. Ich möchte einstweilen die Frage hiermit zur öffentlichen Diskussion stellen. So viel ich sehen kann, wäre hiermit der einzige Weg gegeben, den Pastor vor sittlich unberechtigten Gehaltsabzügen zu schützen.

EDITORIALS

THE PASTOR AND THE ECONOMIC DEPRESSION

For nearly three years the country has been in the grip of an unprecedented business depression. The nations of Europe, especially those which were on the losing side in the World War, had been living at starvation rates for some time, but now the grim spectre of hunger and raggedness is stalking through our own land. We had long thought that America was exempt from the catastrophes that visit less favored countries, and Europeans had learned to adopt the same happy prejudice with regard to ourselves. But now they have come to see that the American colossus seems to have the same feet of clay that other empires have had. We are feeling in our own bodies now what business stagnation means, we don't have to have our imagination stimulated by the tales of the travelers from foreign lands.

How long is this depression going to last? is the anxious question on many lips. People who seem to know speak of "cycles" in upward and downward trends. They tell us that in the last fifty years we have had eighteen periods of depression. No less a man than Sherwood Eddy disclosed to us the other day that these "cycles" last as a rule six years; that, therefore, we have just come to the middle of the present one. That sounds discouraging. The fortunate thing about it is that we have lived as long as Sherwood Eddy, and perhaps a little longer—and we do not remember eighteen periods of depression, nor that anyone of them lasted six years. Nor was any of them as bad as the one we are now having. We had a business depression during the second Cleveland administration (1894-96). It was bad enough but nothing to compare with present times. But even that didn't last quite six years, if our memory serves us right.

We get the impression that no one speaks with a voice of authority on the calamity that has befallen us. No one seems to be very sure why it developed to such a magnitude. No one wants to assume the role of the prophet telling us when the turn is going to come. There have been voices assuring us it was all a matter of psychology; if we only could recapture that old American optimism all would be well. These voices are not so self-confident any more. The bankers tell us if we only put the hidden dollars

in circulation again, the wheels of trade would begin to turn once more.

The conviction appears to become stronger from day to day, that the cure won't be as easy as that. People of high and low degree come to feel our whole economic system is wrong. Socialists have been saying that for many years, but now it is spreading to all classes of society. At the Ohio Pastors' Convention, meeting at Columbus in January this year, the report of the respective committee on the causes of the depression, was a downright indictment of the capitalistic system. It said: "The capitalistic system has for its central aim the acquisition of wealth. Its method is that of unbridled individualism and ruthless competition. A just regard for the human being has never had an important place in it. The profit motive as a domination of life cannot be reconciled with the Christian ethic. A Christian community must be built on the cooperative method of life. The objective for which all economic activities should be carried on is the enrichment of the life of all people." After stating these ideal aims the report went on to recommend such specific matters as a minimum wage, sickness and unemployment insurance, old age pensions, etc.

This almost wholly socialistic program was accepted by the Convention without debate! Of course, it should be pointed out that the whole report had been worked out by a professor of the State University (possibly a professor of sociology). The ministers—many of them—did not feel competent to challenge its paragraphs in open debate. They had only a general feeling that the capitalistic system was bad and that the Christian spirit demanded a new one.

The fact that no one voted against the report did not prove that all were in favor of it. It only reflected the state of uncertainty most ministers find themselves in when it comes to applying Christianity to our economic system. Most of them don't know enough about it to commit themselves. The older ones grew up under the individual gospel, and it is not easy for them to adjust themselves to enlarging views. And even those who are in touch with modern movements feel that they can only treat these matters tentatively. Not only that, they know that innumerable books have been written on the subject. The leaders on social questions are admired and listened to eagerly. But nevertheless. things remain as they are. The progress is so slow that their ardor cools and they decide to wait for favorable developments. They are not very anxious to pursue a course that is apt to involve them in unpleasant consequences. It sounds heroic when another report (at that Convention) says: "The pulpit must continue to make itself a spiritual 'nuisance' in creating public opinion against the pres-

ent pagan order in industry and business." Who, replies the average minister, wants to make his pulpit and himself a spiritual nuisance? It is very idealistic, but it is bound to make the pastorate brief—and who wants to move every two or three years?

Logically, a pastor who finds his element in the work of "Christianizing the Social Order" should go the whole length, he should be a Christian Socialist. What other party will he align himself with? Only the Socialists have a real reform program. As far as economics is concerned, the Socialist party is the only one with which he can join hands. It seems our brother Hahn (in Buffalo) has done—and is doing—the consistent thing. But who is willing to pay the price?

THE PLAN OF UNION

When we were informed (Herald Jan. 8, 1931) that on December 19, 1930 the negotiations towards union with the Reformed Church in the United States had been broken off, we were not only disappointed but also very doubtful whether there was any hope that our ways would soon meet again. Our General Conference at Rochester, New York, had (in 1929) enthusiastically and unanimously accepted the "Plan of Union" and it looked in that year as though not only the Reformed Church but also the United Brethren would vote favorably on the proposed merger. But 1930 proved to be fatal to these hopes. First, the United Brethren disappeared from the picture. Their General Conference adopted the plan, but with them, so we were told, the congregations have the final voice and the congregations were against it. Then the Reformed Church surprised us. They had taken up again a scheme, previously considered, of uniting with the Presbyterian Church and kindred bodies. They sounded out our commissioners on that project, but were told that these had no authority to go on along this new line. So, on the date mentioned above, our men were notified by Dr. Richards, of the Reformed commission, that for the present everything was off. All the friends of the proposed union, and there were many, had a sinking of the heart when their high hopes were all at once so sadly frustrated. It is true that in some districts and with some individual pastors, the feeling of an affinity with the Reformed Church is not so pronounced. They would rather see a union with some more broadminded branch of the Lutheran Church. Still, taken by and large, this Lutheran current doesn't seem very strong. It certainly has not so far found very decided expression.

As stated above, our hopes for a resumption of the efforts for for a union were not very optimistic. We knew the Reformed pas-

tors here in Cleveland were heart and soul with us, but we feared that the prospect of union with the large Presbyterian Church would prove more alluring to the Reformed Church than one with us. However, the plan of a merger with the Presbyterian bodies must have gone on the rocks, for towards the end of 1931 we heard that negotiations between the Reformed and our Synod had been opened again. It seems that circumstances—or shall we not say, providence?—were working in such a way that ultimate union would be the logical outcome. At any rate, the commissions of the respective churches have worked out again a "Plan of Union." It has been submitted to the churches and pastors of the Synod by its publication in the Herald of March 31, this year.

The Plan, as far as the organization of the future united church is concerned, follows very much the same lines as the former "Basis of Union." The name, "The Evangelical and the Reformed Church" is certainly not very satisfactory, but in the absence of a better one and in the hope that the future will provide an improvement—it may stand.

We notice that the Stationing Committee of the former plan has been omitted. We know it was objectionable to the Reformed; some of our own people also feared that it put too much power in the hands of the district president.

In this Editorial it is impracticable to discuss the whole Plan. We shall only make a few remarks on the "doctrinal basis." The former plan sought to provide such a basis in a brief summary of the tenets of our Christian faith. The present Plan does not make any such attempt. It only says, "We acknowledge and accept the historical confession of the two churches as the doctrinal basis of the union." We cannot see that there should be any difficulty for us to subscribe to this fundamental statement. Our own confessional paragraph recognizes the Heidelberg Catechism, the chief confessional standard of the Reformed Church, as a true interpretation of the Christian faith. Our position as a "Union" church pledged us from the very beginning to a Union program and policy. It may be conceded that our fathers, in adopting such a policy, were simply adapting the Prussian Union to their new environment without thinking particularly of the Reformed Church in the United States. But if Reformed and Lutherans could find a common basis and organic union in Prussia, why not here?

The Plan does not involve a surrender of conviction or viewpoint on either side. Calvin emphasized more the sovereignty of God, Luther the love of God. We can learn from both. As to the Lord's Supper, some of us may have the Calvinistic view and others may find more in Luther's interpretation. Can we therefore not both together go to the Lord's table? The Editor was born into

the Reformed Church, was later confirmed by a rather strict Lutheran and has since then belonged to and worked in a "United" church. He has never felt that different views on the sacrament have made spiritual fellowship impossible; he will confess, though, that when the administering clergyman used the form: "this is the *true* body," he was compelled to make a mental reservation.

The Calvinistic (and Augustinian) double predestination doctrine has never been taught in the Heidelberg Catechism, nor in the Prussian branch of the Reformed Church.

In regard to the liturgy, the Lutheran Church has made a distinct contribution to the upbuilding of congregational worship. Here the Reformed Church, originally, practised a policy of rigid simplicity and extreme scripturalness (nothing but psalms to be used). Today we notice in all churches a growing desire for a richer worship program, one in which the congregation takes an essential part. Both our churches will cooperate here, in response to an evident need and in an increasing realization of very valuable ideals.

Both churches are more or less committed to the Social Gospel. Our very membership in the Federal Council (with its "Social Ideals") implies that.

Of course there will be difficulties and problems in plenty as we go on in carrying out the Plan and its implications. But consolidation is in the air. If Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists could unite in the United Church of Canada and do it with the greatest success, we can't see why we couldn't unite with the Reformed, to the benefit of both of us.

The Plan will be considered by the General Synod of the Reformed Church this year, after which it will probably be sent down to the nearly sixty classes of that church body, which meet during the late summer and fall. The results of all these discussions on the part of the Reformed brethren, will then be gone over by the joint committee of both denominations and a report will then be submitted to our district conferences next year, from which the project goes on to our General Conference for final disposition.

We see every phase and aspect of the great Plan will be thoroughly threshed out. There will be no undue haste or failure to listen to dissenting or simply unconvinced opinions. Still, we are persuaded that our Synod is committed to a Union policy and we hope we shall live up to our ancient principles and to the insistent call of the hour.

Sollen wir Rom beneiden?

Einige Monate lang habe ich eine Kirche bedient, die ohne pastorale Versorgung war. Der Kirchenbesuch war unbefriedigend; mehr als das, er war „unter aller Kritik." Auf dem Weg zu dieser Kirche fuhr die Straßenbahn an einer katholischen Kirche vorbei (polnisch oder böhmisch), nur eine kurze Strecke von meiner entfernt. Die Frühkirche war gerade ausgegangen. In großen Massen strömten die Leute hervor, zu hunderten zählten die Andächtigen. Ich dachte an die kleine Schar, die mich erwartete. Wie kommt es, daß Rom den Protestantismus so überschattet? Wir nennen uns die Kirche des Evangeliums, der offenen Bibel, des: „Jesus allein!", und was sonst auf unsrer Fahne stehen möchte: und die Leute achten es nicht. Ich erinnere mich an eine Gemeinde, die ich vor Jahren in Missouri bediente. Die Katholiken hatten ihre Kirche gerade gegenüber der unsern. Im Sommer setzten wir abends aus, weil die Leute nicht kamen. In die andre Kirche drängten sie sich scharenweise hinein. Der Gottesdienst war kurz — keine eigentliche Predigt — aber die Leute waren da.

Legt man die Sache unsern Gliedern vor, so sagen sie: Ja, die Katholiken müssen zur Kirche gehen, es wird ihnen eingeimpft von Kindesbeinen an. Als wenn das irgend etwas erklärte. Warum prägen wir es unsern Leuten nicht ein von Jugend auf? „Bei uns ist Freiheit, bei den Katholiken ist Knechtschaft." Kardinal Gibbons sagt dazu in seinem „The Faith of our Fathers": „Die Protestanten sagen von uns, wir trügen Ketten. Ich weiß nicht, ob dem so ist; aber wenn wir Ketten tragen, so sind es goldene Ketten, und wir sind stolz darauf."

Man kann nicht umhin, Rom zu beneiden, ob seiner imposanten Organisation, seinem Eindruck, den es auf die Welt macht, seinen erhabenen Kirchen, in denen das „Numinöse" so stark zur Andacht zieht, und ob der Loyalität seiner Glieder.

Rom ist die Erbin einer langen und Bewunderung einflößenden Vergangenheit. Als das kaiserliche Rom unter den Schlägen der Barbaren zusammen sank, fiel sein Mantel auf das geistliche Rom, das Zentrum der organisierten Kirche. Es christianisierte die heidnischen Völker und entließ sie nie aus seiner Obhut. Im Mittelalter führte es einen siegreichen Kampf mit den weltlichen Gewalten. Alles, was Kunst und Wissenschaft leisteten, ward in den Dienst der Kirche gestellt. Die Kirche war eine weltumfassende Macht, aber auf dem Weg dazu war die Welt in die Kirche gedrungen. Die Kirche konnte nicht mehr sagen: „Gold und Sil-

ber habe ich nicht," aber auch nicht mehr zu den Gichtbrüchigen: „Stehe auf und wandle!"

Die Reformation kam und bot den Völkern eine mehr geistliche Form der Anbetung. Aber in europäischen Landen geriet der Protestantismus in Abhängigkeit von den Fürsten und verlor Freiheit und Katholizität. In Amerika wurde Protestantismus gleichbedeutend mit dem „right of private judgment," woran die Reformatoren nie im Traum gedacht hatten. Als eine Folge davon sprangen die Sekten wie Pilze aus dem Boden, so daß die Römischen mit Verachtung auf diese Selbstauflösung ihres Gegners herabblickten. Rom zu beneiden ist natürlich genug, doch völlig nutzlos. Die Frage ist: Was können wir von Rom lernen? Der Protestantismus — auch unsers Landes — hat schon von Rom gelernt. Die starke Betonung der Notwendigkeit einer würdigen und lebendigen Liturgie liegt auf dieser Linie, sowie das Streben nach eindrucksvollen Gotteshäusern. Auch der Nachdruck auf den objektiven Charakter des Sakramentes — obwohl hier nie das unerläßliche persönliche Element außer Acht gelassen werden sollte. Auch die Zusammenfassung protestantischer Kirchen in dem „Federal Council" und die Erweichung denominationeller Selbstsucht hat uns Rom wie die Not der Zeit gelehrt.

Bei alle dem können wir Roms Macht und äußeren Erfolg weder anstreben noch erwerben. Wir haben nicht Roms System, noch Roms Prestige; wir haben keinen Papst und keine Hierarchie. Auch sehen wir nicht, daß bei den Kirchen, die das bischöfliche Amt noch haben, das Ansehen der Bischöfe wächst. Im Gegenteil. Der evangelische Geistliche empfängt wenig Stärkung durch sein Amt. Distrikt und Synode sind notwendig und gut, aber sie helfen dem einzelnen Geistlichen wenig, wenn er in Schwierigkeiten mit seiner Gemeinde gerät. Wenn er eine starke, geistlich gerichtete Persönlichkeit ist, mit ausdrücklicher Predigtgabe, so bedeutet das viel. Wenn er nicht so sehr das ist, aber weiß, wie er Leute zu behandeln hat und dazu eine liebenswürdige, gewinnende Art besitzt, so ist das für den äußeren Erfolg mehr wert als alles andre.

Der Protestantismus hat viele Schwächen und Mängel. Deshalb gibt es in ihm starke Strömungen, die romwärts streben, der katholische Flügel der Episkopalkirche läßt sich dahin hören, daß es in Zukunft drei Kirchen geben wird: Römische Katholiken, Protestanten und Episkopale. Wir würden dem hinzufügen: und Lutheraner!

Jedenfalls entspricht manches im Protestantismus dem Zug und Streben der Zeit. Wenn er außerdem die Pflege dessen nicht unterläßt, was wir am Katholizismus bewundern, so wird seine Zukunft besser sein als seine Gegenwart.

Sie waren beide ihrer Sache gewiß.

Unsre editorielle Aeußerung zu dem Plan of Union (mit der reformierten Kirche) erinnert den Schreiber dieses an ein Erlebnis aus seinen jungen Jahren. Ich wurde am Niederrhein geboren, in der preußischen Rheinprovinz, woselbst der reformierte Glaube seit Jahrhunderten starken Fuß gefaßt hatte. Der Pastor, bei dem ich in den „Unterricht" ging, war Lic. theol. O. Stoltenhoff (einer seiner Söhne ist jetzt Generalsuperintendent der Rheinprovinz). Stoltenhoff war nicht nur ein sehr gelehrter Mann, sondern (aus Elberfeld stammend) auch stark reformiert. Bei der Besprechung des heiligen Abendmahls erklärte er uns, daß die reformierte Auffassung (dies **bedeutet,** statt dies ist mein Leib) die logisch und textlich einzig haltbare sei. Auch nehme diese Erklärung dem Abendmahl nichts von seinem Charakter als Gnadenmittel. Es sei nicht nur ein Symbol, sondern auch ein Träger geistlicher Güter.

Diese Erklärung leuchtete mir, dem Knaben, sehr ein. Ein Jahr später aber war ich Schüler in dem berühmten Gymnasium zu Gütersloh und wurde mit 53 andern zur Konfirmation vorbereitet. Unser Geistlicher war Pastor Braun, ein Gottesmann, wie ich seitdem kaum einen gesehen habe. Aber stark lutherisch! Er erklärte uns, daß Brot und Wein der **wahre** Leib und das **wahre** Blut Christi seien, die von uns **mündlich** genossen würden. Er sei in seinem Herzen vor dem Herrn gewiß, daß diese Auffassung allein dem klaren Bibelwort entspreche.

Braun war mir eine große Autorität, aber in diesem Punkt gab mir seine Auslegung doch keine Befriedigung. Hier hatte ich zwei kompetente Leute, jeder war gewiß, daß seine Auffassung, obwohl von der des andern ganz verschieden, die einzig richtige sei. Ich mußte also zu dem Resultat kommen, daß es in der Religion Dinge gäbe, über die man verschiedener Meinung haben könne. Es war mir später eine Herzstärkung, bei O. Funke (dem bekannten Bremer Geistlichen) zu lesen, daß es in der Tat Anmaßung oder Fanatismus sei, zu behaupten, daß man in solchen Streitpunkten seiner eigenen Meinung vor dem Herrn als der absolut richtigen gewiß sei.

Können denn Leute, welche über das **ist** oder **bedeutet** verschiedene Meinungen haben, doch gemeinsam zum Tisch des Herrn gehen? Diese Frage ist in der preußischen Kirche längst bejaht worden. Das reformierte Rheinland und das lutherische Westfalen sind seit einem Jahrhundert aufs engste kirchlich verbunden gewesen.

Ebenso ist es bei uns stets gewesen. Wir haben stets an den Wahlspruch des Augustin gedacht: „In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas," und besonders: „in omnibus caritas." Heutiges

Tages, wo es sich um die Kernfrage des Glaubens handelt, um Gottes- und Heilandsgewißheit und um das Reich Gottes, wäre es Verblendung und rückständige Verbohrheit, verlangen zu wollen, daß es im christlichen Glauben keine verschiedenen Meinungen geben dürfe. Der fromme Reformierte und der fromme Lutheraner suchen im Abendmahl beide Glaubensstärkung von dem erhöhten Herrn. Ob sie dies beim **ist** oder beim **bedeutet** erhalten, sollte doch ihm überlassen bleiben.

Und wie beim Abendmahl, so ist es in andern Dingen. Beide Kirchen haben etwas zu bringen bei der Vereinigung. Sie wollen denn mit ihrem Pfund wuchern, so daß es beiden zu gute komme. Was für einen Zweck hätte es, alle Sonntage zu bekennen: Ich glaube an eine heilige allgemeine christliche Kirche und dann nichts zu tun, um diesem Glauben zur Verwirklichung zu helfen?

The Christian World

A Christian Attitude Toward Communism

William E. Gilroy

The determining of what is a Christian attitude toward communism would settle the question regarding a Christian attitude toward much else. Moreover, the immediacy of this issue gives it prime importance for two reasons:

First, communism, or what passes under that name, is the motive power of a great social upheaval, which, whether one regards it as gravely menacing or morally challenging, can not be ignored. Second, the term "red" or "communist" has become widely used, even by professedly Christian people, as an opprobrious epithet to apply to anybody, who stresses the evils in our social system and who urges in dealing with these evils full freedom of legal speech and action, in accordance with our basic principles of government.

Let it be said at once that the belief that communists or any other group in the community should have full right to the expression of their opinions, provided they break no law, does not imply upon the part of any believer in free speech agreement with the communists' attitudes and opinions, or with the attitudes and opinions of any other group. The editor of this paper, for instance, as an independent in religion, stands at the opposite extreme from the Roman Catholic, yet he would fight to the last to uphold the right of the Roman Catholic to the expression and practise of his faith. Religious liberty is a meaningless principle if it implies liberty for only one sort of religion; and, similarly, free speech under the conditions established in the very foundations of American democracy is meaningless if it implies free speech only for some people and not for others.

The obverse side of this priniple implies that neither the communists, nor anybody else, should be accorded special privileges or immunity against illegal action. There are certain limits of the freedom of speech that have been definitely established by law. When speech is libelous, the man who utters it assumes legal responsibility for its libelous nature. In our judgment the action of the Civil Liberties Union in sponsoring recently the defense of the Massachusetts communists who characterized ex-Governor Fuller as a "murderer" was as ill-advised and unjustifiable as the action of that valuable organization has been well-advised and justifiable in other cases where the rights and liberties of individuals have been grossly and wrongfully invaded.

It is in a strict and impartial enforcement of law, in upholding every form of speech and action that is legal, and in putting down by

due process of law every form of speech and action that is illegal, that the Christian citizen who is fair-minded, both as Christian and as citizen, would hope to see liberties safeguarded. If the laws themselves are in any sense unjust, it is up to good citizens to seek the repeal of these laws and the enacting of better laws. Most, if not all, of the tragic incidents and situations in connection with labor conflicts in this country could have been avoided if there had been upon the part of the authorities wisdom and determination in enforcing the laws with strict impartiality, in suppressing on the one hand illegal action, either on the part of capital or of labor, and in upholding with equal vigor the exercise by either side of every legal right of speech and action. The duty of working for such conditions seems to us a prime obligation of the individual, alike as citizen and as Christian. But when law and authority function illegally for the suppression of speech or action that is in itself legal, the protest of any individual does not mean that he approves of the actions or opinions, but simply that he protests against the illegal and arbitrary action of those whose duty should be to maintain rather than to interfere with legal rights and liberties.

It is interesting to note that in connection with the recent occurrences in Lawrence, Mass., a Christian minister who was foremost in protesting against the arbitrary and illegal action of the authorities, and who was on that account accused of being a "communist" and an emissary of Russia, remarked to the editor that, as a matter of fact, if he were in Russia the first thing that would happen to him would be that he would be put up against a wall and shot. The ground of this man's protest was not sympathy with Russian communism, but the much simpler matter of belief in American principles of liberty.

We stress these things because a Christian attitude toward communism can not be dissociated from a Christian attitude toward the communist, and before any Christian accuses a fellow mortal, in reprobation, of being a "red" or "communist," he is in duty bound in all fairness to inquire what that label may mean and whether it be justifiable. The fact is that labels thoughtlessly or unfairly bestowed easily tend to become libels. They are forms of expression of judgments in which the man who is libeled has no adequate opportunity of defense. The duty of at least seeking to understand our fellow men before we label them or condemn them is a duty to which no Christian can be recreant.

As regards real communism and real communists—that is those who not only accept the label, but who glory in it—a Christian attitude would imply much the same spirit. First of all, it would seem a Christian duty, as much as an attitude of intelligence and common sense, to seek to understand communists, if we are going to assume any attitude toward them at all. The study of commuism and communists will very quickly reveal the fact that the terms can not be arbitrarily applied to one particular set of ideals or to one particular sort of people. There are *Christian* communists, whose ideals and visions of society are comparable to those of the New Testament communist,

Barnabas. A communism in which one would seek the establishment of a voluntary society in which all men would live according to the ideals of Barnabas is manifestly something very different from a communism such as has been attempted in Soviet Russia, a communism of compulsion, carrying with it elements of dures and tyranny. Between these two extremes of a free communism, growing out of a Christian spirit, and a communism of force and compulsion, there have been varying types of communists and communism. Oftentimes the term has represented the visionary and dreamy ideal of the man who has professed it, who, far from being a dangerous character, has been a man of gentle unselfishness, imagining, with amazing optimism, that every individual, if only he had a more favorable environment, would be as good as himself. Such in large measure was the communism of that great man of love, the late Prince Kropotkin, though Kropotkin's ethical and social ideals were closely related to his scientific assumptions and conclusions.

Is there anything that all sorts of Christians might have in common in their attitude toward any, or all, of these various types of communists? Yes, there is. It is the attitude of Christian love. No matter how much we may regard a man as mistaken, or how dangerous and menacing he may appear in our eyes, there is no warrant in Christian practise for a loveless attitude toward him. Love does not imply sentimentality; nor does it imply weakness or compromise with what one believes to be wrong; but love does imply courtesy, fairness, and patient consideration. It implies understanding; it implies an effort to understand even the criminal and the influences that have tended to make him criminal. It ought to imply an effort to understand the agitator and prophet of discontent, and the causes that make him that way.

If we regard communism as something against which we ought to fight, we can not even fight it intelligently and effectually without studying it and knowing just what it is. Blind bigotry gets us nowhere even in our warfare against error and evil; rather it gets us ourselves farther along the way of evil and error. The Christian attitude toward communism and the communist ought to be one of open-eyed, open-hearted quest of an understanding. Such an understanding need not evoke a favorable attitude toward communism either in theory or in practise. Certainly for a great deal that has been done under the name of communism one can have only the deepest loathing. But the Christian can not make any very wide study in revolutionary philosophy or revolutionary movements without becoming impressed with the sincere and unselfish devotion of many who have participated in them. It is worth while sometimes to ask what some of those whom we condemn as "red" and "communist" have stood to gain by their action. Certainly nothing for themselves. Christians who lay stress upon Christian sacrifice ought at least to appreciate their willingness to suffer for their ideas. Can a Christian contemplate that devotion, even to ideals that he himself regards as dangerous, without feeling the challenge to a larger measure of unselfish devotion to his own ideals? Is his attitude toward the communist to be simply that of

denouncing him as an anti-social agitator, or will he display to the world with equal vigor and earnestness his own ideal of a true society?

The effective answer to communism most assuredly can not come in this modern world from those who are indifferent to the fundamental elements of justice in a democracy, or to the supreme demands of love and brotherhood as Jesus proclaimed them. If Christian ideals be thought of as the only valid and adequate foundation for that social well-being which for Christians is symbolized in the Kingdom of God, and for the coming of which all Christians daily pray, it must be said that the fervor and intensity of many revolutionaries, and their capacity for sacrifice, are a constant challenge to Christians to manifest any professed superiority of their faith by their works and by an equal measure of consecration, unselfishness, and devotion, in building a social order of love, truth and righteousness. The professed Christian who is not fundamentally devoted to that great end is not really Christian at all. In his judgment of the communist the Christian must not forget that he himself is judged by the rigorous standard of the law of Christ.—*The Congregationalist.*

* * * * *

The Sunshine Corner

He sits by the kitchen stove. His hair is white, and his face is peaceful. He is totally blind in one eye, and the sight of the other is so impaired that it is with difficulty that he gets about the house. When he goes to the stores some one must accompany him. His occupation's gone because of the impairment of his faculties. Once he was an expert cabinet-worker. Later he repaired furniture. Now, he makes violins! Laboriously he toils to shape and assemble these musical instruments. He has three of them within reach, his own creations, and he enjoys sitting in his rocker, bowing his fiddles, and listening to the oldtime music, although his hearing is so defective that it is with difficulty that any one tries to converse with the old man. Several fingers are missing, too, the result of an accident. And yet he makes music! Once he enjoyed attending the Universalist church near by, but now he can neither see nor hear, and he feels alone, unable to participate in the worship. And yet he plays his violins! Perhaps you, reader, are sorely afflicted; perhaps your courage has failed. Let this old gentleman, sitting in his rocker, making music in the winter of his life, be an example for you.

God does not leave us wholly alone, without any resources, lacking all compensations. Let us discover something useful that we can do, no matter how humble, and let us add not to the discomfort of those about us, but let us make music, for those about us, and perhaps we shall find that peace which passeth understanding.

—*Pennsylvania Universalist.*

No Easy Way Out of Chaos

James M. Yard

This essay is sure to be pessimistic, but if so it is only because I am trying to look at the world as it is. A pessimist has recently been defined as one who knows what is going on.

Two years ago this article started out to be a discussion of religious chaos. Since then our confusion has been worse confounded. We are confused not only in our religious thinking. There are plenty of books about God—and they exist not because of our great interest in religion, but because of our confusion. We do not accept authority; we do not know, and up to the present very few of our leaders dare to say just what they think.

But not only is there religious chaos, we are discovering that we are in the midst of a terrific social revolution that is influencing every class of society and every phase of life. Mr. Lippmann's "A Preface to Morals" and some of Bertrand Russell's books have described and furnished evidence of a chaotic state of our thinking about morals. We have political and business graft; we have prohibition in all its phases;we have stock market gambling—ethical confusion. We have no Ten Commandments, no Ark of the Covenant, no Mercy Seat.

And recently we have had a book by the Dean of Harvard called "Business Adrift." Even a man like Thomas Chadbourne, a New York banker, says "the capitalistic system is on trial." Charles Beard and Stuart Chase write books about plans, saying we have no plan. There is economic confusion.

Truly we are living in a difficult intellectual climate. But it may be that only a change of climate in all our thinking will suffice to do away with some of the evils of our present day. Some of the evils seem to be insuperable. But I suppose pre-historic man thought the mammoth was unconquerable. He was until the climate changed and he disappeared.

I am not willing to believe that this is the end of what we call civilization, if civilization means comfortable living and gentle manners. If it means merely comfortable living and gentle manners for a few and drudgery and starvation for the many, then I hope this is the end. I think we certainly have come to the end of an epoch. A great historical age has come to a close and we are trying to move over into another period that will be quite different. In short, I hope that what we are enduring is birth pangs and not death pangs. I suspect a change is coming over social, religious, and business institutions such as occurred, for example, when man first emerged from the brute. We are in a new world and can not become quickly adjusted.

What has caused all this change and this chaotic thinking?

1. We have been detached from the soil. Our culture is a rural culture; our family system grew up on the farm; our religion was wrought out under the wide sky; our laws were made by and for farmers. Our miraculous machines have drawn us into cities, detached

us from the soil, hidden the sky from our eyes, and we do not know how to live under such conditions.

2. Rapid transportation is confusing not to individuals but to the whole of society. Exploration and emigration have detached us from our mother countries. National cultures have been torn asunder. We often hear lecturers rejoicing in the fact that the world has become unified. But that is part of our trouble. We live so close together that a break-down anywhere confuses us all. Germany comes to the end of her rope and Mr. Hoover has to declare a moratorium. Japan and China go to war and the whole Western world is involved. We do not know yet how to act in a unified whole. Japan does not know how to act. She acts as though she were living in the old days of the Shoguns.

3. Anthropologists, sociologists, and archeologists have rifled the Ark of the Covenant, and they are the agents of social dissolution. For our grandfathers the Christian religion was the only way of salvation, and they had no doubt about it. For the grandfathers of the present Jews the Jewish religion was the only one acceptable to God, and they had no doubt about it. For the grandfathers of present day Mohammedans and Buddhists their way was the only way, and they had no doubt about it.

But their grandchildren have studied Comparative Religion. They have studied Comparative Morality. They have discovered that moral customs and state laws and religions grow and develop as men live together. They have no belief that these human institutions were given them by some superhuman wisdom. There is, therefore, lacking the note of authority that kept people in line fifty years ago.

These changes are too sudden and too terrific. No man can grapple them. Truly the acids of modernity have bitten deeply into our very souls. The result? Whether we like it or not, we are in the midst of social revolution. A typhoon is sweeping over our whole social system.

4. In thinking of the causes of our present chaos we must not forget the World War. It destroyed lives; it destroyed wealth; it destroyed values and ideals. As one has put it: "To have lived through those years is forever to have lost the pristine faith of youth in an ordered and glamorous universe, and to live on the edge of doubt as to the security of civilization." That is chaos.

We have struggled for years to pay the war debts in dollars. We are becoming ever more keenly aware that we have been and are continuing to pay for the war in moral ideals. We killed men by the millions without a quiver until the very value of life itself was questioned. Human values were not important, so crime has grown apace. During the war and immediately after, industry went in for profits—regardless. The world became obsessed with the desire for money and what it would buy.

All these things together have produced moral, religious, intellectual, and economic chaos. Perhaps we could sum it all up and describe it as a profound and terrible intellectual revolution. Intellectually everything is upside down. Foundations shift.

There can be no easy solution to the problems that face us in all human realms, whether in religion, or education, or industry, or international affairs. We do not like to tackle difficult jobs. Machinery has made life complex, but it has also made it easy. When we want water we turn a tap. When we want ice we turn an electric switch on the frigidaire. If we desire to travel a thousand miles we sit in a most comfortable car and push a little button with our toes. If we have trouble with the icebox or the car we call in an expert and raise no questions.

There seem to be no experts with any authority in the intellectual and moral realm. I suspect that one difficulty is that our leaders are too timid. Very few speak courageously or even think daringly. I recall vividly what was said a year ago at the end of an address in which I had given expression to some of the above ideas. "You have described the chaos very well and have shown why we are confused, but you have not shown us the way out." I did not show the way out partly because I did not see any path ahead, and partly because I did not dare to shock my hearers too profoundly.

Another difficulty in doing any real thinking on such problems is that we are determined at all hazards to preserve an institution—it may be our banking system, the Methodist Church, or the Republican Party. So when in our thinking we come to the place where if we are to go forward we must consider the possibility of a world without the Episcopal Church or our present industrial system, we get dizzy and our minds utterly refuse to function. We do not fear the falling of the sky if the Buddhist Church should cease to exist, but we simply dare not contemplate a world without our own particular religion.

The people who have gone beyond chaos and have become adjusted in some degree to this immense and swiftly changing world, are those courageous souls who have dared to think of a world without the confinements of their religion, or their political party, or our present economic system.

1. The way out of intellectual and social chaos, therefore, is by frank, courageous thinking and speaking. Courage clarifies the atmosphere. That is difficult in a country for the most part as conservative and tradition bound as is the United States. For example, a woman is queer and not acceptable socially if she has any original ideas about prohibition, war or race. Unless we think freely in an utterly untrammeled way we shall merely muddle around in our chaos.

2. The way out of our economic chaos, as we have been told again and again during the past year, is by realistic, scientific planning. Modern men face no problem that is greater than that of their aggregate existence. How can we live in some kind of decent harmony with our fellow men when the size and intricacies of our social machinery tends continually to aggravate the vices which make human life inhuman? How shall we bring the life of great political and social groups under the dominion of conscience and moral law? These are problems on which hang the future of civilization.

We plan our machinery. We carry on unflinching research in

methods of producing steel or silk, but when it comes to human problems we hesitate. Julian Huxley in a recent number of *Harpers* told a very pointed and fascinating story about how planning brought prosperity back to Fiji. The plan cost a great deal of time and money and almost infinite patience, but it was carried out to completion. It, however, involved moths and not men.

"The men are still alive and active who brought prosperity back to Fiji. It had already been discovery that the cause of the trouble was a little moth—very beautiful, with violet wings— whose grubs devoured the leaves of the palm trees; and it prospered so alarmingly because in Fiji it had no parasite enemies. Three biologists were appointed to find a parasite. They searched the remote corners of the Pacific. At last they found, in the Malay States, not the same moth, but a closely related species, which was provided with its natural complement of parasites, notably a kind of fly. It was not easy to bring the parasites the long distance to Fiji, for they do not hibernate, and so must be fed and tended all the time. They had to be provided with living moth-caterpillars, and these, in turn, had to be provided with newly-sprouted coconuts, grown in specially built cages. As there was no direct communication from this part of the Malay States to Fiji, a steamer had to be chartered for the voyage.

"By these means, three hundred precious parasitic flies were in 1925 safely landed in Fiji. These were bred on the caterpillars of the Fiji coconut moth, and within twelve months had increased to thirty-two thousand. Then the liberation of the parasites began, and they went to their work with such gusto that by 1928 at least four-fifths of the coconut-moth caterpillars of Fiji were parasitized and, therefore, came to nothing. By 1929 the coconut-moth, which threatened to ruin the archipelago, had become reduced to the status of a minor nuisance."

Until our intellectual, industrial, and political leaders are willing to plan as courageously and deal as unfalteringly with problems involving human relations and economic systems, we shall never find any path out of our present unendurable confusion.

—*The Christian Leader.*

Catholic Recovery

By the Rev. Edmund Smith Middleton, D.D.

As the Anglican communion enters upon the centennial period of the Oxford or Tractarian Movement, it is of special interest to the American Church to note what progress has been made in the way of recovering the common Catholic heritage, lost or greatly obscured at the time of the Reformation. While it must be admitted that the number of parishes allowing Morning Prayer to usurp the place of the One Service instituted by our Blessed Lord is greatly in excess of the so-called Anglo-Catholic parishes, where the Mass has regained its right of being the chief service on the Lord's Day, yet there is abundant evidence that the Catholic leaven is gradually and surely leavening the whole lump.

John Henry Newman, on the eve of his submission to Rome, wrote a book on *The Development of Religious Doctrine*, in which he sought to prove that all the later doctrines of the Church had their source either in plain statements of Holy Scripture or in justifiable inferences from such passages. In other words, the seeds of all Catholic doctrine existed from the beginning and that in due course followed the full fruition of religious teaching. That was a progressive process but Catholic Recovery in the Anglican communion may be described as a reaching back to re-clothe the Bride of Christ with the garments which she once possessed and of which the English Church should never have been stripped by Cranmer and his Protestant advisers.

Here in America, in particular, Churchmen have much to be thankful for, though at times Catholic-minded souls must experience discouragement and wonder that a Living Branch of the Holy Catholic Church should be so little responsive to the vital stream of truth and beauty which are rightfully hers. At least, the American Church has altars now and crosses on them in most places, and even the churches, which still cling to Morning Prayer as the principal and proper mode of offering worship to Almighty God, yet have their early Eucharists, which the faithful few attend, though the bulk of the congregation still wends its leisurely and convenient way to the 11 o'clock service. When true Catholic consciousness comes to animate American Churchmen, the survivors in the enviable epoch will once more believe that the Mass is the thing and will tolerate nothing less. At present they are being deprived of their right as Catholic Christians and one cannot help wondering where the responsibility lies.

The gains in the way of Catholic worship, the growing sense of priesthood and sacrifice, an increasing use of Confession, the institution of Religious Orders, the more general use of Retreats, the gradual sinking of the old parochialism, and the accompanying emergence of the idea of the Church at large as One—all these things are the fruits of Catholic Revival. The American Church may well take courage and thank God for what has been accomplished.

But (and one pauses in awesome wonder at the thought), what is the next step in Catholic Recovery to be, now that the Churches of the East and the Old Catholics have recognized the Catholic character of the Anglican communion and are proffering full communion? Will the American Church, alone of all Catholic Christendom, continue to flaunt its Protestant title in the faces of these new brethren, whose Orders and Catholicity are recognized even by Rome? Is there something peculiar about the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, which permits it to indulge in idiosyncrasies, which are likely to be regarded elsewhere as American examples of bad taste? And furthermore, to come nearer home, will those who have the opportunity and the responsibility of leading and moulding the thought of the American Church continue (as they have done in the recent past) to dismiss the matter of a change of name as "a tiresome and ever recurrent question"? If saving the American Church from its present ambiguous and illogical position is merely "a tiresome question," then heaven

help her, for it will then be seen that the responsible leaders of the Church will not assume that duty.

In view of the new relationships, referred to in the preceding paragraph, what will the second century of Catholic Revival bring forth? One may catch a vision of a distinctly nearer approach to a real Catholic Unity, in which the Mass will be used as of old in the Anglican churches and the Nicene Creed given back all four of its ancient notes of the Church, "One, *holy*, catholic, and apostolic." And, oh! blessed and wondrous return of Christian charity and peace, one will be able in any land to hear Mass in any tongue and receive Holy Communion at any altar throughout the Christian world. God speed the day!

Carried along by such a picture of the future one sees the Protestant Episcopal Church shedding its peculiarities like scales—its chief Bishop properly styled Primate, instead of by a phrase, "Presiding Bishop," descriptive of that office; its provinces provided with archbishops, as elsewhere in Christendom (even Canada has archbishops); American bishops discarding the Genevan black and white (disrespectfully referred to in some quarters as the "magpie") and clothing themselves once more in the purple vestments of Catholic bishops throughout the world; translations of bishops from one diocese to another for greater usefulness as is the usage everywhere; and, greatest wonder of all, the American and other Anglican bishops exercising their ancient and apostolic rights collectively in Council and Synod. They have not lost, they have only surrendered, their lawful rights as chief pastors and teachers. After all is said and done, theirs is the chief responsibility for the well-being of the Church.—*The Living Church.*

Agreement on Unity

The Unitarian and Universalist commissions on unity have done the logical, sensible, the Christian thing.

They have made an agreement that the next step to be taken by the two denominations in their approach to each other should be the step of federation, with the door wide open to all liberals who may now wish or who may hereafter wish to enter the federation.

If the two denominations approve the report of the commissions, they will continue their separate corporate existence. No trusts will be disturbed, no traditions will be destroyed, no individual churches will be shut up or combined except as they would have been any way.

But an aggressive, united free church organization will be set up to stop disintegration, wake up the sleepers, war on discouragement and uncertainty, and plant the liberal movement in fields white for the harvest.

This plan is not our plan, and the way taken is not our way. This may lend an added note of sincerity to our statement that in our opinion it is a good plan, a right way, and ought to be ratified with practical unanimity by both the Unitarian and the Universalist fellowships.

It ought to be obvious to any one that the method adopted by the

commissions is based on faith that understanding and good will between the two groups will increase. The united free church movement will stand or fall by the answer to the simple question, "How do you like him?" The fact is that in most cases Unitarians and Universalists have had to reply to questions about the other, "I do not know." Close as we have been in theory, in practise too often we have known about as much of one another as the average apartment house dweller knows of the man upstairs or down.

Where people in the two fellowships without too many fixed ideas have come close together—for example the national Unitarian and Universalist young people's groups—beautiful cooperation has taken place.

We have not much doubt about the growth of understanding, good will, respect, affection, between the two bodies.

What lies deeper in the plan of the far-seeing leaders on both sides is the hope that there will come a rebirth of missionary zeal, or what the Orthodox call redemptive love. There is such a thing as an all-absorbing purpose to free minds, purify hearts, and enrich lives, which is not dependent on any old blood theology.

What our two denominations need is that world-conquering purpose which has characterized Orthodoxy at its best. The question that we have to face is, "Do we care?" Is there even a bit of that deathless love of our fellow men in our hearts that characterized Jesus? Are we willing simply to take the easy way out and earn the epitaph," "He has et up all his corn?"

We hope that in a high, unselfish, loving spirit we shall discuss the new plans for unity.

We could grow as eloquent or vituperative as anybody over some things in the past, but would anything be accomplished? And we could be as timid and imaginative as anybody about the future, but we prefer to let the future prove the wisdom or unwisdom of the plans now being made.

If we liberals are what Higginson called reformers, Esquimau dogs that have to be hitched to the sled by a separate thong, if we can not work in one harness without turning and eating one another up, then let us find it out. But if that happens, we pray that some merciful Christian will knock both dogs on the head.

Unitarians and Universalists have a past that is thrilling. Out of a present beset with difficulties they may move into a future just as thrilling in its service of mankind if something can only wake them up.—*The Christian Leader.*

A Plea for Denominational Consciousness

George H. Lewis

It is an indisputable fact that today the Universalist Church is not as strong as it has been in the past. We have lost many churches and others are tottering. Our ministers are fewer than formerly and many, still in fellowship, are without churches, working in other de-

nominations or in other fields. There is a decided contrast to the growth of earlier days and a sad lack of enthusiasm and loyalty on the part of laymen and ministers. There are some glowing exceptions, but in both pulpit and pew there is manifest uneasiness and a desire to find the way out. Meanwhile local mergers, federations, and what not further diminish our power.

At Providence, under the urgence of certain leaders, with the cordial invitation of a representative of the Congregationalists and the reluctant *auf wiedersehen* of a prominent Unitarian, the project that was generally understood to be the first step toward organic union with the Congregationalists was declared adopted, with but one dissenting vote from a veteran whose voice is now silenced—though there were others who voted "No" and more who remained silent.

At Buffalo the process was repeated, only then this union was to be with the Unitarians and the opposition was more outspoken.

At North Adams Dr. Leining depicted the situation with an inimitable and vivid portrayal of the willing but doubtful old maid violently courted by both suitors. It was a masterful and laughable presentation of a pitiful situation, brought about by an increasing loss of denominational consciousness, a feeling of failure, and a dizzy bewilderment of always going somewhere but starting for somewhere else before we were even well on the road.

Never yet have we as a denomination carried to a successful conclusion any plan. Sickening illustrations are the "Twentieth Century Fund," the "Five Year Plan," "Cent a Day," full time president, ministerial pensions, etc. The Washington Memorial Church might be cited as an exception, but the end of that is not yet.

The present suggestion is that he who would save his life must lose it, but the quotation is, "Whosoever will lose his life *for my sake*." This calls for sacrifice for a principle—not for lack of one. If it has any application to the Universalist denomination it indicates giving up all we have and are to that for which the Universalist Church stands—not giving up the Universalist Church.

To inveigle us into union we are told that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," but we must remember that that lump must be of the right material. The leaven would have slight effect on cement, even though it be in flux. Paradoxical as it may seem, Universalism and Universalists have had the greatest leavening effect when they have remained outside as entities. That work is by no means done.

To continue that work effectively we must continue as a separate and distinct denomination. To continue as such we must have a strong denominational consciousness, a devoted loyalty, and a plan to conserve our resources and to utilize them to the best advantage.

In no way does this preclude our working with any other denomination in so far as it will work with ours. This has often been done, but in each case the cooperation and the results were greater when we came together as distinct and separate denominations uniting for a common purpose.

On the other hand, a corporate union with any—even if the means could be found to hand over our properties and even if all churches accepted the situation—would result in a considerable portion of our people slipping away into other communions or out of all church affiliation.

We have had all too much of federation. Like degenerate and prodigal sons we have given away with lavish hands the hard won heritage of our fathers.

To conserve what is left we must give up all idea of giving up. We must utilize all that we have. We must take care of our own ministers. Their training, experience and loyalty are valuable assets—assets that any worth while business organization would seek to retain. We should not shut out worthy men who would come to us, but they should be tried out carefully. We have had all too many skyrockets and tramps, thinking only of themselves and abusing our hospitality, to the detriment of our church and to the disadvantage of our own men.

To utilize what we have we must have a real denominational policy under stronger and more capable superintendency, with greater cooperation on the part of both ministers and churches. Men with special ability for certain work should be placed where they are most needed and can work best, and moved on as they are needed. Every man should be kept at work. We need less politics and more efficiency; wiser supervision and real cooperation on the part of supervisors. In so far as we have lacked these things our church has suffered. Illustrations are omitted for want of space, not for lack of material.

If we feel that for us one church is as good as another, we are not much good to the Universalist Church and it is not much good to us. We need a denominational loyalty that will lead our people who move from one town to another to seek out the Universalist Church and to organize one if there is none there. It may be said that the time for this has passed, but that is how one of the fastest growing churches grows.

We need to assert our Universalism. In many of our churches Congregational, Unitarian, Pentecostal Mission and other hymn and service books are used. In fact, anything but a Catholic missal or "The Key to Heaven" may be found. The same conditions exist in our Sunday schools.

Of course, we all know the answer. Apart from the unrepressed idiosyncrasies of some of our ministers and the expensive parsimony of purchasing the supplies that cost least, we have little to offer. The services and responses in even our latest hymnal—to say nothing of many of the hymns—were antiquated before the book was published and often voice absolute denial of our faith. The answer to this is to get out and to get in to all of our churches and Sunday schools proper and adequate books.

In our theological schools more or less is taught about every church except our own, and many children pass through our Sunday schools and even into church membership with no more knowledge of the distinctive place and purpose of the Universalist Church than they would

have had if they had gone to a Sunday school of some other denomination. And the number of such seems to be increasing. What wonder that as a denomination we are slipping!

It may be that if these conditions continue we can not keep on, but is not the obvious answer to change conditions rather than to give up? If we can have the plan, the wiser supervision, the denominational consciousness and loyalty, there will be no question of conservation and growth. If all our ministers will stop casting longing eyes on the apparently more flourishing gardens of their neighbors and cultivate their own fields the results will be both surprising and gratifying.

In these days of a weakened and apologetic Orthodoxy, of an easy going and purposeless Liberalism; when men know not where they are going, nor why, and do not care; with panaceas that cure nothing and answers that do not satisfy; when the mysticism of the East and the frenzy of the more fanatical sects fatten on the credulity of the ignorant —there is needed more than ever before the clear, illuminating, distinctive message of the Universalist Church.—*The Christian Leader.*

Folded Their Tents

The much talked of and much criticized Conference of the *House of Bishops* and *National Council* met in *Garden City*, L. I., N. Y., April 26, 27, 28. A lovely place to meet, a section of beautiful residences and gardens with a cathedral and spacious Bishop's home in the midst of it, with every indication of wealth and luxury, free from all the distressing sights of congested areas. Bishops came from all over the country; all expenses paid through anonymous generosity arranged for by the genial host, Dr. Ernest M. Stires, Bishop of Long Island. National Council agents were all there and permeated every corner of the conferrence. Whenever exigencies required they quickly became the loud speakers of the occasion. Be it remembered that this was not a Council, this meeting had no authority to legislate, no constitutional status, no canonical powers. It was merely a conference, a voluntary get-together, in spite of the fact that the Presiding Bishop automatically selected himself as the Convener. Some go so far as to say that this meeting was just another bright idea incubated at "281 Fourth Avenue", and was to be brooded into a dove of peace at Garden City and the heralds there were to proclaim the praises of the National Council and its wonderful works throughout the Church as an answer to current searching criticism concerning its extravagance and incompetent management.

The real conference opened rather auspiciously with the presentation of the Fiske report, (which we publish elsewhere in this issue), a temperate but very damaging examination of National Council activities. This was followed by further criticisms. Bishop Fiske and his associates in the report were supported by Bishops Johnson, Page Manning, Taitt, Davis and a few others and opposed by Bishops Barnwell, McDowell, Sherrill, many of the subsidized Bishops and the whole National Council entourage. To the casual observer it was evident that there was even a bitter difference of opinion, a distinct loss of confidence in the works and administration of the National Council, that

the Presiding Bishop did not seem to know what it was all about, that his address was no explanation but a rather lame apology to Council's critics; that all the agents of the Council were working in perfect harmony to protect their positions, that they had an acquired skill in evading direct questions, that the Vice-President is a very clever man and the Assistant to the Presiding Bishop a needless appendix, and that at present the stranglehold of the National Council upon the Church cannot be broken. After meetings, services, entertainments, progressively diluted resolutions which covered National Council with a very thin coat of whitewash, these many good men folded their tents like the Arabs and stole away home.

But criticism will grow, resentment against National Council for refusing to obey General Convention's "mandates" will take the form of passive resistance, the sums of money needed will not be given. We predict that in the intervening period before next General Convention the Church will become more aroused and the hope will be encouraged that then the Church will discard the system that prevails now at "281". The present National Council has been weighed in the balances and found wanting. Why should it be allowed further to cumber the Church?—*The Chronicle.*

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)
NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*

The Resurrection Fact by *Doremus A. Hayes*, Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Graduate School of Theology, Evanston, Ill. Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. 1932. 355 pages, $2.00.

It is quite a common thing in modern biographers of Jesus to take us as far as the crucifixion and leave us there. As though that was the end of his story; as though it was understood among modern scholars that the resurrection could only be the product of pious imagination. It has always seemed a piece of brazen insolence to us for any writer to cut out the last chapter and act as though it was not in the record, when everyone knows that the same witnesses who tell us about his life and death—and are accepted as trustworthy—tell us also about his resurrection. The only justification these falsifiers of history have for ignoring the Easter story is their objection to the miraculous. But does ruling out the miraculous element in the gospel do away with the difficulties? Does it explain the "moral miracle" of Christ's personality (Bruce)? And does it not make the origin and growth of the church an unsoluble riddle when the plain fact has to be acknowledged that this church was built on the faith in the resurrected Christ?

The book under discussion takes a decided issue with these "advanced" critics. It shows convincingly that the story of the resurrection is one of the best attested facts of gospel history. The author assumes that there are ten "appearances" of the risen Lord and he discusses every one of them. He sometimes draws heavily on his imagination in having to supply the picturesque detail when there is, perhaps, nothing given but the bare name of the person to whom the appearance was granted. This is, for instance, the case where he enlarges on the appearance to Simon (Luke 24: 34). He labors pretty hard to fit in this particular incident into the other facts of Easter Sunday. But otherwise, he always makes us sure that we are on the soil of solid fact.

To the stories in the gospels he adds the Pauline testimony, especially in Romans and in 1st Cor. 15. He shows the supreme place Paul gives everywhere to the resurrection of Jesus; that he indeed did "determine to know"—and preach—nothing but Jesus Christ and "him crucified", but that the cross received its light and meaning—for him—in the fact of the resurrection. It seems to us that this point, the resurrection of Jesus considered as the seal of the father upon the work of the Son, might have received stronger emphasis.

But we hardly dare to criticize the book, because it is so fair, so thorough, so appealing, so convincing. Nevertheless, we may point out a few points of disagreement. The author defends the descensus ad inferos (1 Peter 3), Christ's going to Hades and preaching to the spirits in prison. We hold that this point is neither sufficiently attested, nor clear enough, to be made an article of faith. Again, the writer suggests that Jesus died on the cross of a broken heart, owing to the "darkness" and what it meant. We think that his triumphant sixth and seventh words are not in keeping with this suggestion; that he rather gave up the ghost because he had power to lay down his life (John 10, 18) when his work was done.

Dr. Hayes has a brief but good chapter on the resurrection *body* of Jesus: "The resurrection body of Jesus was a body, capable of manifestation as a physical body with physical wounds and physical functions, but superior to all physical needs, a spiritual body, the fitting, adequate and perfect instrument of the glorified spirit of the Lord." This doesn't explain that Jesus could eat and did eat although he didn't need food. If he ate he must have had digestive organs, how then could these be there if they were ordinarily not to function? Well, we know that some of our Wurttembergian theosophers wrote deep words about the glorified body, but they were all speculations; we shall have to agree that one can only guess about it and perhaps, it is just as well to do as most Americans do, that is, leave it alone.

The book is the best spiritual food for the Easter season we know; a real tonic to the one who has been made weary or unsettled by the modernizers. We give it our most cordial endorsement and commend its careful perusal to those on the right and those on the left.

The Bible in Religious Education by *J. Sheatsley*, D.D. The Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. 270 pages, $1.50 net.

The purpose of this book is to show that the Bible offers the only adequate standard for religious education, the only positive basis for moral thinking and is the only source from which we may learn the real purpose of life. Our whole system of education, so says the author, is onesided, a training for this world, with the moral and spiritual elements wholly missing. For the developing of these the Bible is the only reliable text book. Its authority arises from the fact that it is the product of divine revelation. It does not offer its imperatives as the result of the moral consensus of the civilized race. It is not the record of human religious experience but of God's making himself known to men. We are driven to God and the Bible for any definite knowledge of God and of his will and purpose. "The otherworld life must be made regulative of this life."

The International Council of Religious Education, which has been giving us the International Lessons, is committed to the modern view, according to the author. Modernism neglects the religious elements of the Bible story, that being one reason why it is so fond of bringing in other than biblical material.

The writer is wholly in agreement with the modern tendency to make the instruction pupil-centered, i. e. to adapt it to the capacity of the child; to use liberally the arts of illustrations; to impress upon the pupil the fact that religion is mainly a thing of practical living, not of creed or intellect only. He shares the view that we must aim at character trraining; but he cannot approve of the over-emphasis modern education gives to establishing right relations to our fellow-men. He thinks that love to God comes first and, after that, love to men. He frequently quotes "Religious Education" (the organ of the Religious Education Association) and notes its over-statements along this line, as, for instance, the claim that all *shared* values are religious values, or the tendency to build up character with human forces and motivation. Then he stresses the home and the responsibilities of the parents concerning the religious training of the child with great vigor. The child needs not only character training, it needs a new birth, but this change is in most cases a gradual growth into the Christian life. Over against the forces of naturalism, materialism, and the evils of industrialism, Christian education has a hard battle. Still, the forces for righteousness are by no means insignificant. If we live in the Word, if home and church and all its organizations cooperate, if we can develop an integrated program of education for the church, the outlook is promising. Today we expend our whole strength almost on external things. A return to the Word of God will open up new possibilities; if we learn to lift its hidden treasures, the gain for the moral and spiritual life will be great.

The writer does not make any claim to be up to the minute in scientific method. His intention is to safeguard the religious interests in the matter of education and to stem the flow towards secularism. He, therefore, is concerned with high and legitimate values and he fights as a good soldier of the Lord Jesus Christ. His style is popular, he is quite an expert in the art of illustration. His book deserves a general support and a large measure of success.

Cultivating Personality by *William S. Walsh*, M.D., author of "The Inferiority Feeling", etc. E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., New York. 1930, 288 pages.

"This volume is not offered as a technical treatise nor as the solution of the many perplexing problems which a study of personality presents. It is merely an attempt to treat the subject in a way that will enable the reader to apply the material to everyday life. While personality as a whole—the sum total of all a man's physical and mental characteristics—is discussed, most of the book is concerned with the so-called *pleasing* personality and how it may be gained." Personality as a *factor in winning success* in life is the real theme of the writer. The opinion is quite general that substantial, great success in life is chiefly dependent on a man's intellectual equipment. The writer is at special pains to show that this is an ill-founded prejudice. Aside from scientific and related fields where brain power is naturally

of prime importance, a man of mediocre intellect but a winning personality has a better chance at success than a man with a brilliant mind but unpleasant characteristics. He says the efficient man is usually a man of ordinary brain power but who learns all he can about his job or business and endeavors to observe a kind, tactful attitude towards others. The poor scholar often rises higher than the honor student. Of course a man's work must be congenial to him. Interest in one's occupation promotes enthusiasm and leads to accomplishments. And again, success depends fifty percent on knowledge and the other fifty percent on mental attitudes and a pleasing, cheerful disposition.

Business is not a philanthropic institution—at least it has not been in the past—it is out for profits and the one who increases its profits is the one sought after. The man who is courteous, tactful, considerate of his subordinates, loyal to his employers, accommodating in his contacts with the public, recommends his firm and enhances its standing and prosperity. From these basic conceptions the writer goes on to take up the common faults that militate against the acquirement of the right kind of personality, to show how they arise and to offer constructive counsel founded upon an understanding of the genesis of the faults.

It might be argued that a minister's main object is not a pleasing personality but a sincere heart and an earnest mind; that he ought not to try to please men but to better them; not to give them what they want and like but what they need. There is of course, a measure of truth in this objection, but doubtless, if rebuke and sternness is at times required the people will rather take it from a man they like than from one they don't like. We heartily endorse the writer's contention that a man with average ability but a pleasing personality far outranks in success the brilliant but unpopular one.

The writer is a psychiatrist, but the book deals little with the abnormal and morbid side of personality. He seems to us a good guide along the line of his chosen subject. His style is clear and pleasant, his information is full and many-sided. It is a helpful and stimulating exercise to take a chapter or two at a sitting and listen to the skilful analysis and wise counsel the author dispenses.

How Shall I Learn to Teach Religion? Teaching through the Experience of the Pupil by *Blanche Carrier*, M.A. (Instructor in Religious Education, University of Pittsburgh). New York and London, Harper and Brothers Publishers. 1930, 216 pages.

We have been giving more space lately, in these pages to the subject of religious education (see our discussion of Vieth's "Objectives" Jan., 1931, several reviews by O. Reller and a number of others). We intend to keep in touch with this important matter, which in these later years has received such an unusual share of attention. There is hardly anyone who is not convinced that our Sunday school work can stand a great deal of improvement. Before we have trained teachers, adequate equipment and facilities it will be impossible for

many Schools to try some features of the new method, but we should at least be acquainted with progressive educational movements and adopt as much of their program as is practicable.

Now the book under discussion today is trying to explain and commend to us the so-called "experience-centered" religious education. To adopt it would mean an entirely different procedure in our Sunday School work, it would also mean that our teaching staff would need a great deal more training than they have today. But let us see what this "experience-centered" education is. We hear, in the first place, that this new movement owes most to Professor J. Dewey, of Columbia University. To many this statement may not be a great recommendation of the book or the method. They know that Prof. Dewey is not strong on religion; what, then, could we learn from him for religious education? Still, we should remember that many movements that have carried the process of civilization forward have been started by people in whom skepsis was stronger than faith. Some of the leaders of the theory of evolution were agnostics and were vigorously opposed by the church, and yet, what do we see today? Nearly the entire American church, as far as the spokesmen are concerned, are inclined to accept evolution (and only we, of German ancestry, are still on the outside). Or again, to take a leaf from the political record, the efforts for parliamentary reform in Germany were sponsored by the so-called "48 ers", mostly men of the liberal type and indifferent, if not hostile, to the church. But today we are nearly all convinced that their political revolutionary ideas have received the approbation of history.

So might the new education movement, although not started by churchmen, who are naturally conservative, yet contain a great deal of good sense that the church and Sunday school could well afford to accept. The author says, a new method of teaching is needed because there is such a change in our present-day world. She refers to the changes in the technical world that have made modern life so complex; to the international developments that have begun to make us "world-minded"; to the critical study of the Bible that has revealed to us the human side of the Bible; to the changed status of youth, that was once one of subjection but is now one of freedom. All these things are bound to have effect on our system of education. We cannot any more dictate what the religion of our children is to be, we have to lead them by understanding, persuasion, argument. Still more: we have to enable them to make *religious experiences* while under our teaching. The old method—she calls it the Herbartian—is out of date. According to it the teacher was to take a passage of the Bible, find the meaning of it and then suggest to the class how it was to be applied. Then, next Sunday (or next lesson hour) another passage was to be treated the same way (tying up the new thought always with the old) so that in time there would be a great many passages and truths stored up in the mind, which occasion would call forth when needed.

We do not know whether this is an adequate description of the Herbartian method, but it is certainly the method we applied. The author says, this is all wrong, it is ineffective. The purpose of the

Sunday school is not to teach the Bible, but to teach religion. Religion is a matter of spiritual experience and can only become a part of the child's mind by supplying it in the way of experiencing. The new method is creative, not transmissive. We imagine she means that the teaching must make an impression on the child, that its whole being must be called into action by it. The experiences of the men and women of the Bible must become the experiences of the children in Sunday school. To accomplish this, there are needed activities, discussion and worship. How the school is to supply these activities in sufficient number seems hard for us to see, except on special occasions. Elements of this activity feature are: memorizing, writing, construction, dramatization. All three parts of the program (activities, discussion and worship) receive the most thorough treatment. The worship part, especially, is worked out with great care in the book.

We were much impressed with the book although we do not quite see how every lesson can be made a matter of religious experience. We sometimes don't agree with the writer's theology. Her idea of God as the loving father seems somewhat sentimental and overdone. She says, God's "heart breaks everytime that sufferings come to us" (What then about his heart during the World War!). But these are matters that have nothing to do with the new method. The writer's experience is that the experience method will help us out of the passive boredom and inattention so familiar in Sunday school. The book is very stimulating. We shall be eager to hear more about this method, to us a very new one, indeed.

Open Doors in Religious Education by *John Wallace Suter, Jr.* Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York. 1931, 128 pages.

Without aiming at a systematic presentation, the author discusses various phases of Sunday school work as they come into his mind.

He is aware that a great deal of emphasis is now put, in religious education, on the right kind of method. The learning process receives even more attention than the result of the pupil's learning. The teaching, so says this method, should be pupil-centered, not lesson-centered. And teaching is not simply the impartation of knowledge, its object is to take the child through a religious experience. What this experience should be and how it should be produced in the pupil, we have dwelt upon, to some extent at least, in the discussion of the book just preceding this.

The writer, while open to the light of the new method, puts, however, greater weight on the necessity of the teaching and learning being *Christ-centered.* The content of the Christian faith must not be treated as something to be relegated into the background in modern schools. Nor is it to be shorn of the ancient characteristic of authority. It is not an outward authority that we are to listen to, but the authority of greatness. The words of Christ, the faith of the church and the history of its achievements invest it with an unquestioned authoritativeness. Not all of its teaching and faith is adapted to youthful

experience. Nevertheless, with a maturing faith the young will grow into it.

A great deal of attention is given to the subject of worship. A beautifully conducted service of worship, the writer, who is an Episcopalian, considers the main thing in Sunday school. As the use of the Prayer book is no excuse for not cultivating liturgical talent in the church service, so should much care, time and effort be expended to make the worship part of the Sunday school its chief attraction. Such an atmosphere will make a lasting impression on the children. It will be the soil in which Christian nurture will come to full fruition in Christian feeling and living.

What is Hell? by *Dean W. R. Inge;* Sir Oliver Lodge; James Moffatt; Annie Besant; W. E. Orchard; F. W. Norwood and others Harper and Bros. Publishers, New York and London, 1930. 186 pages.

It is seldom today that a pastor announces a series of "six sermons on Hell"—although this happened less than twenty-five years ago in the city in which Reviewer was then living. Nor would it be possible even for an evangelist to "hold sinners over the burning pit" with any of the nerve-wrecking effect Jonathan Edwards was able to produce. Still Hell has by no means ceased to be a reality for Christians and the attempt is made in this book to present, from a number of sources, a composite view of what Hell is to the modern Christian. Of the twelve theologians who write in this volume, not one seems to incline to the modernistic tendency to eliminate Hell altogether. They all agree on the fact that Hell is something final. Not one seems to have arrived at the Universalist solution that the grace of God will ultimately be victorious over every kind of sin; that, in this sense, the time will come when God shall be "all in all."

Inge, who is the first writer, thinks that, of course, the conventional picture of Hell (of medieval and Puritan times) is not compatible with a just and merciful God. Modern science also, he thinks, makes it impossible for us to localize heaven and hell. In this respect, we submit, Inge's remark has little force, for modern science is just as unable to dogmatize on the abode of spiritual beings as the astronomer's telescope is on the reality of God.

The essence of Hell, its real crux, he says, lies in its unendingness. The idea of a final and permanent state of reprobation is so terrible that modern Protestantism seeks to substitute something less severe for it. Therefore there are those who speak of a "second chance" (Bible Students and others); of conditional immortality; of the annihilation of the finally wicked. Inge goes as far as to say that Protestantism, although in theory opposed to it, really believes in Purgatory. His own view seeks to retain the stern features of the doctrine of Hell, without the ancient extremes. He fails, however, to make himself very clear.

Oliver Lodge, the scientist, declares there are different states of existence, here as well as in the spirit world. Mankind cannot be divided into good and bad. They shade into each other in ever so

many varieties. This constant changing we shall find in the other life, a descent into worse and an ascent into better levels of existence.

Abbot Butler, a Catholic, gives the teaching of his Church on Purgatory. The punishment in Purgatory is in part expiatory. No soul is entirely without sin; therefore it undergoes an experience whereby those sins that were not expiated on earth are removed by suffering. Then there is the purifying aspect of purgatory. The severe but salutary discipline the soul is subjected to has the tendency to chasten and cleanse. The New Testament already speaks of prayer for the dead. If they were to be prayed for they were not perfect, they were in purgatory. The prayers and masses said for the dead alleviate and shorten the period of their suffering.

James Moffatt also contends for due attention to the severe elements in Christ's teaching. If apocalypticism exaggerated these it does not follow that the Lord's statement that disobedience results in final rejection is no longer true.

All of these contributors, while believing in the justice of the judge of mankind as well as in his fatherly love, want to retain the validity of Christ's harsh teachings on the finally lost, and at the same time tone down ancient barbarities. As a result their statements lack definiteness.

Reviewer cannot believe that the eternal (though spiritual) pain of the impenitent can be in the counsels of a just and loving God, nor that such a fate can serve a useful purpose. Therefore we lean toward either the annihilation of these elements or the universalist hope of final restitution.

Meeting the Challenge of Modern Doubt by *James Gordon Gilkey, D.D.* (Minister of the South Congregational Church of Springfield, Mass.), New York, The Macmillan Co. 1931, 249 pages.

The author is of the opinion that we find ourselves in a state of revolution in the religious world, and that it is the mission of religious leaders to so interpret the Christian faith to the present generation as to meet our changed modern conceptions. Dr. Gilkey has sought to make his contribution to this task, as other volumes of his show, such e. g. as "A Faith for the New Generation", "The Certainty of God", "Solving Life's Everyday Problems". He distinguishes four classes as seen from the religious viewpoint: the indifferent multitude, the fundamentalists, the liberals and the radicals (those who have given up faith in God and content themselves with ethics). Of these four he places himself in the liberal column. These Liberals have adopted a new view of the Bible, of the creeds, of Jesus, of the relation to science. They have by no means been able, so far, to furnish a definite and satisfactory re-interpretation of Christianity. But they know a great many, especially the educated youth of the country, look to them for guidance. This book is written to help them; it has no intention of unsettling the faith of those who are satisfied with the old gospel. The author's position is very different from conventional theology.

He sets out with the statement that the changes in the religious thoughts today do not affect minor matters but the very foundations of the religious life. The things modern people are uncertain about is the reality of God; they raise the question, Is Jesus, the man of the first century, an adequate guide for the problems of the industrial system of today?

In times past such questions could be decided by reference to an authoritative church or to an inspired Bible. Today the historical criticism of the Bible has shown us it came into existence and power like every other book. There are not only mistakes of different kinds in the book. Its very views on God and on morality indicate that there is a growth in it from crude and untenable beginnings to higher and still higher levels. The creeds of the church cannot be held binding for they represent the views current in certain periods; they are therefore subject to change and have always to be brought up to the shifting standards of a forward moving development. It may, therefore, be said that the church needs a new gospel. This new gospel will contain four convictions: that God is at the heart of the universe; that he initiated the vast growth-process of evolution; that men are here to realize ethical values; and that endless life comes after death. By the way, if we exclude evolution—which is the discovery of the nineteenth century—these elementary convictions are no better and no worse than the three tenets of the eighteenth century Rationalists: God, freedom and immortality.

But if church and Bible have been dethroned from their place of authority, what is the Christian to believe and what can he be sure about? The author answers this anxious query by saying that we need only a small number of absolute certainties. Science also finds itself in a universe of mystery and uncertainty, but long study and everyday experience have shown that we are living in a world of law and under a process that in the long run results in better conditions. If intelligence and experience are satisfactory guides in science, they can be trusted to lead us safely in religion.

It is true that the new religion—guided by intelligence and experience only—will seem to take much of beauty and comfort out of the old faith. The "Christian epic", beginning in the garden of Eden, going on through the Old Testament with its miracles of divine intervention, rising to new heights in the New Testament, this epic will be curtailed very much. The delights of the Holy Night, the incarnation of the Son of God, his saving death and his physical resurrection—all these will have to be given up. Instead of that, we'll get the story of evolution, the history of a great world process and finally, Jesus' position in it as the inspiring example of the good life of faith and love. It will take master-hands to dramatize this new ethic and invest it with a similar glory as the old one had—but in due time it will doubtless be done. The existence of God, the necessity of faith in a directive intelligence will always remain as a basic element. Religion is a fundamental human need and man needs a faith to satisfy this need. It dawned first on the prophets of the eighth century B. C. that

God is on the side of right. Jesus gave us the faith in the loving father—which he derived from the human love of the parent—and now, today we are adding to the old material the faith that the world can be made better; that we can change evils and do not simply have to endure them.

Jesus has inculcated important truths in our religious consciousness and the surpassing value of personality; that we should help each other and that God helps all. We have a different conception of Jesus than the fathers had, the author goes on to explain: and then he proceeds to give a wholly natural interpretation of Jesus. The miraculous element is entirely eliminated. Jesus had his limitations as other teachers have had. He is the product of his environment, with the plus of being a religious genius. His words do not always apply to modern conditions and the environment of the twentieth century. Some of his principles are of eternal value and others of his teachings have to be discounted.

No wonder the writer feels the wide gulf that divides the new from the old Christianity. "The new Christianity", he says, "has silently cast off its ancient moorings and, like a ship leaving the harbor lights astern, is now voyaging toward a new world beyond an uncharted sea." The process of adjustment to the new ideas will be long and painful, the writers feels compelled to admit, but the end will be peace and harmony.

To us his way out is no way out at all. His gospel is no gospel any more. That God loves all and we should love all, and that Jesus did so first and that we should follow him: to such commonplace terms the Christian faith is reduced by the writer. The first Christian church, however, was built on the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, the crucified. In him salvation was offered to and accepted by the church. To that it owes its existence. That was the gospel they proclaimed and which conquered the world. Make Jesus the moral example only and you may win a few who can't believe in the miraculous. But all the creative periods of the history of the church have fed on Good Friday and Easter and will you tell them it was all a mistake?

Christianity and the New World. An approach to Christian Ethics by *F. R. Barry*, fellow and tutor of Balliol College, Oxford. 1932, Harper and Brothers, New York and London. 317 pages, $3.00.

Is the Christian religion an adequate guide in the changed condition of the world? This is, according to the writer of this book, the great question of today. There is no greater challenge to the Christian faith and conscience than the moral chaos of this generation. The Christian reading of man's nature and destiny seems to many a thing of the unscientific past. Our world is interested in moral questions, not in theology. The liberals in theology, therefore, in trying to vindicate the validity of the Christian religion, interpret it largely as a higher kind of ethics. Christ is to them the perfect character. He is

the fruitful source and matchless inspiration to noble living. The writer of this book believes also that the ultimate appeal of Christianity must be to the fruits of Christian living. Still, it was not the first and highest task of Christ to reveal a new ethic. Real Christianity is not the Sermon on the Mount put in practice. What Christ brought into the world was a new vision of God as revealed in him. His whole life was God-centered. Without his faith in God, his fellowship with God, his life and teaching would hang in the air. His ethical character was entirely a product of his religious faith. It is hence the task of Christian apologists today to *re-enthrone faith in God at the centre* of our thought. This is the thesis of the writer, he sticks to it early and late. It is his contention that without this religious orientation we can't offer the world what it needs at this time and that with God at the centre the whole round of our moral and spiritual requirements will be met. Let our faith first be a right relationship to God and it will surely issue in good living.

Modern civilization has no world view; on eternal things it suspends judgment. Life is for us no longer a unity, as it was in the age of faith, it consists only in a number of specialized activities. The mechanization of life makes ethical living more necessary and, at the same time, more difficult.

It is well that in this situation the Christian world has gone back to the New Testament for orientation. Is not Jesus the great teacher, has he not been the guide of the church in the changing eras of its history? Yes, says the writer, we must go back to the New Testament, but *not to the gospels.* It is here that we find the particular position of the author; here he clashes with the modern theologians. He points out that the church was in existence before the gospels; that the church made the gospels, not the gospels made the church. He tells us that the birth of the Christian faith on Pentecost came about by the witness to the death and resurrection of Christ, not by reference to his perfect living. He dwells on the well known fact that Paul has said very little on incidents of Christ's life and very much on his triumphant death; and that the other apostles agree with him. The very fact, so deplored by the liberal theologians, that our creed omits the life of Christ and mentions only his crucifixion, seems highly significant to Mr. Barry. It is plain, he says, that we must not chiefly rely on Jesus as the perfect character, but on him as the one who makes the presence and power of God felt in human life. At this point we miss, however, an interpretation of Christ's death and resurrection after the Pauline fashion (or any other fashion). That in Christ's reconciliation with God was made possible on a cosmic scale; that in him it was effected basically and guaranteed to all who were to follow after him: on this the writer ought to have spent some time and given some light.

That he who looks in the gospel for guidance on modern problems, is often disappointed, is honestly stated. The New Testament's positive prescriptions as to the righteous life are inadequate. Christ seems to have no concern with the world. It is an other-worldly book that has not so much to do with social duties but with sin, forgiveness, atone-

ment, etc. It seems to have a starved outlook over the width of life; it is a miracle of concentration on one.

Nevertheless to fall in with modern humanism and look to the powers immanent in man for his salvation, is a grievous mistake. Such a recourse will end in pure and mere naturalism. "Christianity while being otherworldly, essentially and relentlessly religious, is at the same time a vital and transforming force within the movements of this-world history. It exhibits itself as the creative nucleus of a rich and transfigured social order. It evokes new qualities from human nature, new range and width, and raises it to new heights of heroism."

The author labors hard to interpret the tension between Christianity's world-denying and world-affirming nature; that the moral teachings of Christ often cannot be carried out but must be interpreted and adjusted to each new stage. There can be, he says, no real "imitatio Christi." Many elements of the good life are not in Christ's example. Christ's life was a supreme concentration on the one pearl of great price. *Not the width of his response* to life but the *quality and intensity* of it was so remarkable. Here he has some fine things to say on St. Francis.

The Kingdom of God Jesus preached was utterly supernatural and transcendental in its origin and character. Doing the will of God is the whole duty of the Christian. But the will of God consists not in private devotional delights (Pietism) or in the rigor and narrowness of Puritanism. It includes all interests and ranges of human life. The author now goes into the various relationships and fields of activity, such as the family, the state, industry, etc., and seeks to find a Christian solution of the difficult problems there confronting us. He always tries to stay within the range of the practical life, he never loses himself in the nebulous depth of philosophical speculation or abstract theories.

What we value in the book is in part the honest admission and clear analysis of the limitations of the gospel when referred to as a guide in the problems of today; and on the other side, the forceful emphasis on the divine factor, on the supernatural source and authority of the Christian faith. "The gospel," he says, "exhibits the inmost essence of God's holiness as a going forth in redemptive love. Thus it leads us to look out on life and to respond to it from a new center. As men are possessed by the Holy Spirit, a new heart comes to be fashioned in them: they are made partakers of the divine nature. All the distinctively Christian claims and insights with their ethical revaluations spring from that supernatural source."

Religion and the Next Generation by *Edwin Ewart Aubrey.* (The University of Chicago.) Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1931. 188 pages, $2.00.

The author of this book, being a professor in Chicago University, the favorite haunt of the "scientific spirit", is deeply impressed with the fact that we elders have to a great extent outgrown the religious conceptions of former days. In what way, then, can we help our

children and young people to get a religion that is in step with the growing knowledge of the time? He realizes very well that it would be a grievous mistake to treat the old traditional views which they learned in Sunday school, with contempt and offer them science for their guide. This would lead only to a bald intellectualism that would give them neither emotional satisfaction nor moral vigor. The "old-time religion" with its divine father and its loving Savior has deeply imbedded itself in their emotions. Emotions have a much stronger hold anyhow upon the mind than rational arguments; and unless we can furnish them moral equivalents in our modern views for the traditional appeal we shall render them a very poor service indeed by our modernizing attempts. At the same time, it is impossible to keep our emotions and our intellect in water-tight compartments. Such a course would lead to "religious infantilism." There must be an integration of the whole personality. It is impossible to be a heathen with the intellect and a Christian with the heart, to use Jacobi's expression. The religion we have, the God we worship must not only satisfy the heart but also be in harmony with the enlightened understanding of the day. Truth is but one, a thing cannot be true in religion and false in science. The faith that gone-by ages had can, naturally, not be the same as the faith of the twentieth century. All life is subject to change and in need of adjustment. So must our religious notions and attitudes adjust themselves to changed world-views. Only, the deep emotional values of the old attitudes must be understood and preserved in a new way, "He who finds the everlasting Christ too incredible to ground a mystic intimacy upon, must form some close-knit bond of fellowship with Jesus in common striving."

In order to drive home the claim that constant religious adjustment is the thing needed, the writer has a chapter on the history of religion, which shows that change and progress have ever been the law of its nature. Religion arose in animism, in the belief that everything had to man in his infancy the quality of mystery, of "soul-stuff." Even in Israel we find that same stage. The prophets of the eighth century rose higher. They spiritualized God and moralized religion. (He doesn't try to explain how it came that they did.) In due time the "carpenter Joshua" of Nazareth appears, a religious genius, who teaches of a loving father and leads a life of love. (The writer's account of Jesus' life and personality is strangely disappointing and inadequate.) Paul, the apostle, makes the religion of Jesus a world-religion. In order to recommend it to the pagans of the time he introduces the mystery elements from the mystery religions. The author goes on to modern times. For us moderns the whole world is as different from that of our fathers as day is from night. The Bible is a different book. The critical analysis of it has robbed it of its miraculous prerogatives. God even has become a different thing to our questioning age. When we boil down what the writer has to say on the subject we find that his religion is mainly idealism. Our ideals make us dissatisfied with the present and with ourselves. We dream of the perfect life, of a Kingdom of God, of a God at the centre of the universe. For those who

can't believe in a personal God it is better to drop that term and put in its place the ideals that thinkers, seers and poets have spoken to us about. These ideals one must try to realize. He must stand by them, work for them, suffer in their service. If one espouses a great cause with real consecration he'll experience the same moral effect that faith in a personal God used to have. Religion is one's philosophy of life emotionalized. Faith is living on the assumption that life has a meaning.

What shall the intellectual, the man whom the writer has in mind do with institutional religion, with the church? "He should give it new ideals more appealing than the old, new hopes more virile than the old, new faiths more certain than the old. It is the task of institutional religion, with such help (as the intellectuals can give), to consolidate idealism into a comprehensive faith."

We fear that the churches will be slow to start on this course. Idealism is a poor substitute for religion. It may do for a few people of good heritage and fortunate environment. The great majority will prefer a real God and a living Christ. Religion with the supernatural eliminated will die of atrophy. Liberalism of the kind advocated in this book will accomplish little and there seems to be a general feeling among liberals themselves that with the old God the old fire has gone out from their altars.